THE

Punjab Oriental Series

OR

A COLLECTION OF RARE & UNPUBLISHED

BOOKS RELATING TO ANCIENT INDIA

EDITED BY

WELL-KNOWN & EMINENT SCHOLARS

OF

INDIA, EUROPE and AMERICA.

No. 19.

LAHORE (INDIA)

THE PUNJAB SANSKRIT BOOK DEPOT

1930.

VEDĀNTA-SYAMANTAKA

(OF RĀDHĀDĀMODARA)

Being

A Treatise On Bengal Vaiṣṇava Philosophy.

EDITED

WITH INTRODUCTION, NOTES AND APPENDICES

BY

Umesh Chandra Bhattacharjee, M. A., B. L.,
Lecturer in Philosophy,
University of Dacca, (Bengal).

Published By

Moti Lal Banarsi Dass

PROPRIETORS

THE PUNJAB SANSKRIT BOOK DEPOT

LAHORE

INTRODUCTION.

1. The Text.

The text of this edition has been prepared from two manuscripts: one in Devanagari character preserved in the Government Sanskrit College, Benares; the other in Bengali character belonging to the University of Dacca. The first manuscript bears the date *samvat* 1922; the second bears no date but looks rather recent.

Aufrecht in his Catalogue mentions several manuscripts of this book. The Dacca manuscript of course is not mentioned there, being a much later find. But of the various manuscripts mentioned by Aufrecht, I was able to secure only the one from Benares; about most of the others, my enquiries were not responded to. There was one copy in the *Bhau Daji* collection of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society; but the Secretary of that Society wrote to me in response to my enquiry that it had been lost. So I was left with only two manuscripts. In the foot-notes they have been referred to as B (=Benares) and D(=Dacca).

The preparation of a text from two manuscripts only would, in ordinary circumstances, be rather risky. But in this case, the difficulty was very much minimised by the fact that the manuscripts used by me were fairly correct, legibly written and well preserved. The language of the book also is generally free from technicalities; and, so, it has not been difficult to find out the correct reading. Besides, there is a large number of quotations from other books—*śrutis* as well as *smṛtis*—most of which are already in print. So far as these passages could be located—and a glance at *Appendix A* will show that most of them have been located—a reference to the printed books was of great use in establishing the true reading.

Had it been a difficult text, or were the manuscripts very corrupt, conjectural readings would have been unavoidable. But in this case I have been spared this trouble and responsibility, except in one or two cases which have been noted in the body of the text.

As between the two manuscripts used for the edition, there have not been many different readings or variants. In some cases, the words or phrases found in one of them were missing in the other. Corrupt readings were also occasionally found; but in most of these cases, the mistakes in one were corrected by the reading of the other; they were not different readings in the strict sense of the term. Now, these cases have been dealt with in the following way:

(i) In the case of obvious mistakes, the correct reading, wherever found, has been adopted and the wrong one quietly passed over, without encumbering the text with notes on the matter. Thus, in one of the mss., in the list of *pramāṇas*, the reading found was '*upalabdhi*', whereas it should obviously have been '*anupalabdhi*'; the mistake is so obvious that any indication of the fact that the reading of one of the mss. has been rejected was considered unnecessary.

(ii) Where real different readings were found to exist and both appeared to give a sense, I have selected the one which seemed to me to give a better sense and noted the other as a variant in a foot-note at the bottom of the page.

(iii) In cases where words or phrases were found in one but not found in the other and where these additional expressions were either absolutely necessary or were at least necessary to make the meaning clear, I have adopted them and incorporated them in the text; but just to indicate that they were not found in both mss., I have put them within square brackets. I have, however, considered it unnecessary always to tell the reader which of the portions thus put within

brackets were found in which of the manuscripts.

The text of the book is full of numerous quotations from different authorities; in some cases, only a general indication is given that the passage quoted is a *śruti* or *smṛti* text but the book is not named; in some other cases, the book is mentioned but no other particular is given; in a few cases only sufficient details are given to enable us to locate the quotation. I have tried to verify all these quotations. The labour has not been inconsiderable. Some idea can be formed of the trouble that it involved when it is remembered that the *Purāṇas* have no concordance like the Ṛg-Veda or the Upaniṣads and that sometimes for a single passage a whole mass of clumsily printed literature had to be waded through. These citations and references have been serially numbered and, as far as I have been able to verify them, their sources are given in *Appendix A.* And to enable the reader to form an idea at a glance of the scholarship of our author, a list of authorities cited by him is given in *Appendix B.* Of course, the quotations do not necessarily mean that the author read all the books he quotes from; he may have quoted from other writers who had quoted these passages. But still a glance at the list of authorities on whom he relied is of interest in this respect that it shows the kind of writings on which this school of thought was built up. It is hoped that these Appendices will enable the scrutinizing reader to transport himself readily to the system of ideas in which the mind of our author moved.

2. The Author.

About the author of this book very little is and can be known. In the colophon, he gives his name as Rādhādāmodara and incidentally tells us that he was a Brahmin; and from the fact that he makes a gift of this jewel (*syamantaka*) of Vedānta to Rādhikā, it is not difficult to infer that he was

a *Vaiṣñava.* We do not know the parentage of the author which is so frequently mentioned by ancient writers. That he belonged to the Bengal School of Vaiṣñava Vedānta is also clear from his philosophy as developed in this book. His salutation to Visñu in the form of Caitanya, with which he begins his work, together with the concluding verse in which he seems to refer to the grace conferred upon Gajapati Pratāparudra, King of Orissa, by Caitanya (*vide Caitanya-candrodaya* of Karnapura, i. 2., and *Caitanya-caritamrta*), enables us to infer that he was a Bengali Vaiṣñava and a devout follower of Caitanya. In this verse at the end of the book, a reference to the story of the release of the king of elephants as narrated in the Bhāgavata, viii. 2-4, may also be read. But the use of the words Gajapati and Caitanya in juxtaposition cannot help suggesting the Gajapati incident of Caitanya's life. Possibly the author was aware of this double implication and even intended it. But his reference to Caitanya is unmistakeable.

These meagre references do not tell us more than this that he was a follower of Caitanya and, therefore, came after him.

In his *Siddhāntaratna*, Baladeva tells us that Rādhādāmodara was his teacher: Thus—

"विजयन्ते श्रीराधादामोदरपादपङ्कजद्युतयः ।
याभिः सकृदुदिताभिर्विनिर्मितो मे महान् मोदः ॥" (viii. 34).

Commenting on this, he further tells us that Rādhādāmodara was a Kānyakubja Brahmin: Thus

"—राधादामोदरः कान्यकुब्जविप्रवंशावतंसः स्वस्य मन्त्रोपदेष्टा... ।"

The similarity between these two writers in thought, language, expression, argument and style is so striking that, even if it had not been explicitly stated, some such relation between them would have to be imagined.

Prajñānānanda in his *History of Vedanta Philosophy* (in Bengali) says that the author of the *Vedanta-syamantaka* was

Baladeva himself. Although it is not altogether unlikely for a pupil to pass off his own work as that of his teacher, still in this case, in view of the explicit statement contained in the colophon of the book and in the absence of any other evidence, it is difficult to accept the conclusion of Prjñānānanda.

We may conclude, therefore, that our author was a Kanauj Brahmin—perhaps a descendant of one of those who came to Bengal at the invitation of its king—and that he was the preceptor of Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa. All that can and has been known about him, is, I hope, given in Principal Gopi Nath Kaviraj's *Introduction* to his edition of the *Siddhantaratna* of Baladeva (*Sarasvati Bhavana Texts, Benares*). We need not recapitulate it here.

3. His Scholarship And Style.

The style of our author is crisp and simple, his language is easy and free from abstruse technicalities; and his exposition is brief, but not too brief. Another remarkable feature of the book is its scrupulous avoidance of polemics. The author gives his own views in a simple and plain language but does not pause to consider the views of possible opponents; he simply indicates his own position without seeking to establish it after demolishing possible rival positions. This self-restraint on his part is remarkable, specially so, when it is remembered that he belonged to an age in which there were a host of philosophical theories in the air and only stating one's position was not enough to claim acceptance for it.

Some idea of his scholarship can of course be formed by a look at the list of authorities cited by him Quotations of passages do not, as we have already said, necessarily mean that the original books in which they occur were read by him: it is possible to quote from quotations in other writers. Nevertheless, we may presume that our author was extensively read in Vaisñava literature.

But he omits to refer to the writinge of Jīva Gosvāmī. Both he and Jīva belonged practically to the same school; and it is not likely that he was anterior to Jīva, for, the latter was a contemporary of Caitanya himself. He and Jīva may have been contemporaries; but even then, considering the voluminous writings of Jīva and the position that he occupied in Vaiṣñava thought, it seems rather striking that a writer of the same school should ignore him altogether. Could Jīva be unknown to him? Whatever the native place of Rādhādāmodara (our author) may have been, he could not have been very far away from Jīva; for, after all, Vaiṣñava culture in Bengal developed within a more or less closely marked area. A total ignorance of Jīva's writings on the part of our author, therefore, seems impossible.

There is another writer of whom mention might be expected in this book: that is Vijñānabhikṣu. There are, of course, differences between Vijñānabhiksu and Rādhādāmodara in many important points. But the similarity also is no less important. In a case like this, we would naturally expect some reference to the writer who holds similar views, if not for anything else, at least by way of corroboration of one's position. Absence of any mention of Vijñānabhikṣu, however, may be explained by imagining a distance of time between him and Rādhadāmodara—the author of our treatise. That Vijñānabhiksu was posterior to Rādhādāmodara seems to find some support in the fact that in his Bhāṣya on the Vedānta-sutras, under ii. 4. 20., Vijñānabhiksu controverts the theory of quintuple admixture of elements (पंचीकरण) in gross matter—a theory that was held by Rādhādāmodara also (See page 27 of the Text) But as Rādhādāmodara was not alone in this position, no definite conclusion is possible as to whom reference was intended.

The absence of any mention of Vijñānabhikṣu is, no doubt, explainable on the supposition that the latter came after Rādhādāmodara. But the absence of any reference to Jīva is more difficult to explain. Perhaps it was due to the fact that our author was only writing a short treatise—a sort of a text-book and did not pretend to give an exhaustive exposition of

the subject and had no ambition to appear learned.

4. The Importance Of The Book.

Although it is but a small book, it is important in this respect that it represents within a small compass a particular type of Vedānta thought which we may denominate 'The Bengal School of Vedānta.' The essential features of this school are:

(i) As a Vedānta, it believes in Brahmā as the ultimate reality. This ultimate reality is a conscious principle from which the universe springs, including what we call unconscious matter. There is no other ultimate reality but this conscious principle. So far this school agrees with all other schools of Vedānta.

(ii) But this ultimate conscious principle might as well be called *Hari* or *Kṛsña* or *Visṇu*. In other words, according to this school, the concept of Brahma is identical with that of Visñu, the personal god of the Vaisñavas.

(iii) This conscious principle or *Puruṣa* is endowed with powers of creation wherewith he brings the world into existence. These powers may happily be conceived as his wives from whom he is never separated. This fits in well with the Rādhā-Kṛsña cult. Or, we might as well conceive this relation as that between Purusa and Prakṛti of *Sāñkhya*. In fact, both these similes have been employed by the Bengal Vaisñava Vedantists for elucidating their idea of Brahma and his creative powers.

In other words, the Bengal School of Vedānta is an interesting attempt to combine the Upanisadic philosophy with that of the Sāñkhya on the one hand and both these with the religion of the Bhāgavata or what is also called the Kṛsṇa cult. Rādhādāmodara is not the only writer—not even perhaps the most prominent—of this school; but his book is a brief and at the same time a complete compendium of the philosophy of the school.

A sub-division of this school, again, is possible: In one branch—that associated with the name of Vijñānabhiksu—

the predominance of Sāñkhya ideas is quite clear. In fact, even a cursory reading of his writings would convince any one that he is seeking to press Vedānta into the service of Sāñkhya and would modify his interpretation of Sāñkhya only to the extent of adapting Vedānta ideas to it. The other branch of this school, while accepting the concept of Prakṛti as helping that of Rādhā, would nevertheless denounce the complete submersion by Sāñkhya ideas of the leading tenets of the Rādhā cult. Of this branch Jīva was a prominent writer, if not the founder also. That this wing of the school had a horror of predominance of Sāñkhya ideas is apparent from the compliments paid by Baladeva to Jīva Gosvāmī while commenting on the latter's *Tattva-sandarbha.* There Baladeva praises Jīva as having rescued Kṛṣña from the quagmire of Sāñkhya ideas:

"यः सांख्यपङ्केन कुतर्कपांशुना विवर्त्तगर्त्तेन च लुप्तदीधितिम् ।
शुद्धं व्यधाद् वाक्सुधया महेश्वरं कृष्णं स जीवः प्रभुरस्तु नो गतिः ॥"

The reference here seems to be to Vijñānabhikṣu; for, no other Vedantist drew so freely upon the fountainhead of Sāñkhya thought.

So far as this subdivision is concerned, Rādhādāmodara must be classed with Jīva Gosvāmī rather than with Vijñānabhikṣu, although he betrays a predilection for Sāñkhya ideas. The reason for this is that, unlike Vijñānabhikṣu but like Jīva, he is definitely wedded to the concept of Rādhā as the inseparable consort of the Creator.

5. The Philosophy Of The Author.

We may now proceed to give a summary of the main teachings of our author. His book is divided into six chapters called '*kiranas*' (or rays) and the book as a whole is called '*syamantaka*' after a bright jewel of that name famous in the Purāṇas. The six chapters deal with (i) *pramāṇa*, (ii) *Iśvara*,

(iii) *Jīva*, (iv) *prakṛti*, (v) *kāla*, and (vi) *karma* respectively. The last five are the *prameyas* or subjects to be proved as distinguished from *pramāṇa* or proof, which latter is dealt with in the first chapter. The primary division of the book is, therefore, into two main sections, viz., *pramāṇa* and *prameya*; and this last, *prameya*, involves five topics.

(1) *Theory of Pramāṇa*:—Rādhādāmodara's theory of *pramāṇa* is very simple and he arrives at his conclusions without much ado. *Pramāṇas*, we are told, are variously enumerated; but the maximum number that need be considered is eight, viz. *pratyakṣa*, *anumāna*, *śabda*, *upamāna*, *arthāpatti*, *anupalabdhi*, *sambhava* and *aitihya*. Of these, some admit only the first, some the first two, some an intermediate number and some again the whole list. But Rādhādāmodara will admit only the first three. The rest, so far as they can be accepted as *pramāṇas* at all, are included in one or other of these three. For instance, *upa-māna* is a combination of *śabda* and *pratyakṣa*. *Aitihya* or tradition is either inadmissible as proof when, for instance, we know nothing about the persons who make the statement, or, it is only *śabda* or *āgama* when we know that the statement is made by reliable persons. And so on. Our author's brief analysis of the *pramāṇas* easily leads him to the conclusion that only three *pramāṇas* are valid.

Of these three again, the first two, viz., *pratyakṣa* and *anumāna*, are often found unreliable and misleading. Examples can be easily found as to how sense-perception and inference give false information. Thus, a drop of water may be perceived as a drop, but when it falls into a mass of water, it is no longer perceptible. This shows the limitations of perception. Besides, errors in perception are also common. In the same way, inference, too, can be shown to be liable to error. Thus, the inference of the existence of fire in a place from which smoke is issuing is not always correct; for, smoke

But Rādhādāmodara would not openly adopt this position; rather he has declared himself opposed to this view. He categorically affirms that the knowledge of ultimate truth must be derived from *śruti* and *śruti* alone. The *ṛsis*, by whom he obviously means the later *ṛsis*, i.e. the authors of the *purāṇas*, &c., are often found holding conflicting views; they cannot, therefore, be accepted as the source of ultimate knowledge:

"...तत्त्वनिर्णायकस्तु श्रुतिलक्षण एव, न त्वार्षलक्षणोऽपि......ऋषीणां मिथो विवाददर्शनेन तद्वाक्यानां तत्त्वनिर्णायकत्वासम्भवात् ।" (p. 4).

How far Rādhādāmodara follows this dictum in practice, is a different question. For, we find him quoting the *purāṇas* as frequently as he quotes the Vedas; and, curiously enough, for conclusions which he cannot support by *śruti* texts, e.g. that about the form *(vigraha)* of Viṣñu, he depends exclusively on texts which are not even included in the usual list of the *purāṇas* such as '*Viṣvak-sena-saṃhitā*', '*Ananda-saṃhitā*', '*Saṃkarsana-saṃhitā*', and so forth. But still in theory his declared adherence to the older Vedānta view of *śruti* as the only authentic *pramāṇa* marks him out from other writers of the same school, e.g. Jīva, Baladeva, and others. If he could stick to this position throughout, he would perhaps have developed a different philosophy altogether. But unfortunately it was hardly anything more than lip loyalty to *śruti*. For, in the very next chapter of his book, in complete self-oblivion, he proceeds to discuss the relative value of the different *purāṇas* (p. 10 *et seq.*) and adopts exactly the same conclusion about them as Jīva Gosvāmī: viz., that the different *purāṇas* appeared at different epochs of time and were suitable for the period in which they appeared; but taking all of them together, it is only the *sāttvika purāṇas* that should be accepted. This is equivalent to saying that we should accept only those which speak of Viṣñu.

It is a contradiction in his system, but the contradiction is more ap parent than real. For, like other thinkers of the

school, he apparently held that the *purāṇas* of his school alone gave the entire truth that was to be found in the Vedas; the other *purāṇas* misunderstood and, therefore, misinterpreted *śruti*. And hence those who had faith in the Vedas might look to the *sāttvika purāṇas* for help and guidance but not to the other *purāṇas*. And he quotes (p. 11) Manu in support of this contention. Ultimately, therefore, his position with regard to *pramāṇa* is not materially different from that of Jīva and Baladeva. Between him and Baladeva the similarity almost verges on identity of examples and expressions (cf. Baladeva's commentary on Jīva's *Tattvasandarbha* with Chap. I of this book). Jīva in his *Sarvasamvādinī* (commentary on his own *Sandarbha*) discusses the question of *pramāṇa*. He gives a list of *ten*, i.e. two more in addition to our author's list of eight. But apart from this, there is little other difference between him and our author. We find a large number of identical expressions and illustrations. But for the fact that these expressions and illustrations occur in all the above three writers, a suspicion might arise in our mind that any of them was a pseudonym for either of the other two. This, however, is not possible in view of the fact that we find them in as many as *three* writers; we should rather conclude from this that these were a sort of stock expressions and examples of the school.

(2) *Prameya*:—The second part of Rādhādāmodara's book discusses the *prameyas* and falls into five chapters according to the number of these *prameyas*. These are: *Iśvara*, *Jīva Prakṛti*, *Kāla* and *Karma*. The *pramāṇas* having been discussed in the first chapter, the second begins with a list of *prameyas* and discusses the first of them, viz., *Iśvara*. The following points are important in the theory of *Iśvara*:

(a) Īśvara is the highest personal Being (पुरुषोत्तम) possessing attributes such as knowledge and joy (आनन्द).

(b) He has no beginning and no end and is the ruler (स्वामी) of all.

(c) We sometimes hear of him as being born; but that only means that he *appears* (आविर्भावमात्र) without loss of any of his natural attributes (अहीनस्वरूपस्वभावस्य).

(d) And salvation can be attained by a knowledge of this divine personality.

It is needless to say that our author bases this conclusion not so much upon reasoning as upon a compilation of texts, *śruti* as well as *smṛti*.

An objection is anticipated that highest personality and rulership of the world have been ascribed to several other deities as well, such as Rudra and Brahmā; can they also be regarded as the *highest* deity? The answer is obviously No. Viṣṇu or Hari and he alone is the highest Being. The other deities are all subordinate to him; they are occasionally described in such a way as to convey the idea that they were the highest being; but this is very much like people paying homage to the servants of the king as if they were the king himself, although they received all honour on behalf of the king and as his representative. The other deities stood to Viṣṇu in the same relation as the servants of a king stood to the king: they derived all their honour and prestige from their master.

This conclusion also, like the one preceding, is supported by a number of quotations from *śruti* and *smṛti*. It is interesting to note that of the various possible rivals of Viṣṇu for the highest position, Rudra or Śiva is considered the most formidable; for, his alleged claims are considered in greater detail and a more elaborate attempt is made to dispose of them. It is, no doubt, a fact that one of the appellations of Rudra, viz., *mahādeva*, itself signifies 'the highest deity'; but, we are told, the prefix *mahā* here has no special significance, just as

it has none in the case of Indra; Indra and Mahendra (=Mahā+Indra) mean the same god; so does *mahā* in *mahādeva* mean nothing more than this that it is a proper name. We have plenty of texts where we are told that Rudra himself had on various occasions to implore the help of Viṣñu and had to *worship* him for such aid. This proves beyond doubt that Viṣñu is the highest deity. No doubt there are also books where Viṣñu is said to have worshipped Rudra and sought his help—but that was only a *Līlā* (लीलारूपमेव बोध्यं) on the part of Viṣñu—his condescending playfulness.

The highest god, therefore, is Viṣñu or Nārāyaṇa. He is the husband of Śrī and is the embodiment of *sattva*; Brahmā and Rudra represent *rajas* and *tamas* respectively. They are thus inferior to Viṣñu. All this is proved by a carefully arranged selection of texts.

The author is not forgetful of the fact that there are texts of a contrary implication also, specially among the *smṛtis*. But he boldly asserts that such *smṛtis* are to be rejected: for, they contravene the *śrutis*, specially those that he has cited. Has not Manu said that *smṛtis* whiche ontradict the Vedas are unacceptable? But he conveniently forgets that *all śrutis* may not justify his position either.

One thing, however, is clear in his treatment of these deities and this deserves our careful attention: He does not deny the *reality* of these deities—not only of Brahmā and Rudra but of many others of whom the *śāstras* speak; he only denies their alleged superiority to Viṣñu. According to him and his school, Viṣñu is the highest deity; other deities also are there, but they are all inferior to him and even derive their very existence from him.

We may note here in passing that in this attitude our author is only echoing the very apparent general tendency of

all sectarian interpreters of Vedānta. He, along with other Vaisñava writers on Vedānta, identifies Brahma of Vedānta with Visñu of their sect and places him at the top of the hierarchy of the gods. But following the same tendency, the Śaivas like Śrikantha would identify Śiva with Brahma and place *him* at the top. But to proceed.

This highest deity Visñu has three attributes or powers (śakti), viz., *parā*, *kśetrajñā*, and *māyā*. It is as endowed with this first power or attribute that he becomes the creator or efficient cause (निमित्त) of the world. And as endowed with the other attributes, he is the material cause (उपादान) of the world. That is to say, the world is not different from him in essence. How far this idea is consistent with the conception of *prakṛti*, which also our author adopts, we shall see later. But here we must note that the world is not conceived as something altogether different in essence from its creator.

In Hari or Visñu, there is no such distinction as between body and soul—a distinction of which we are conscious in ourselves. In Visñu the body is his soul: the essence of both is the same; that is to say, he has no doubt a form, but it is a form of the same essence of which consciousness is made. He is a spirit and has a spiritual form. His body, or what may be regarded as his body, has nothing gross or material about it; it is the same stuff of which the spirit also consists. Nevertheless, it would be incorrect to say that he has no form or *vigraha*. As before, this conclusion also is supported by a number of quotations from accepted authorities.

Three attributes of Hari have been spoken of before; but in fact, he has an infinity of attributes and it is really for this reason that he cannot be qualified by any one of them. And this is why he is described as one without a second—an undifferentiated unity. Yet, owing to the presence of *viśeṣa* or differentiation of a peculiar kind, he can still be treated of as dis-

tinguishable from an other than himself. This *viśeṣa* is not exactly a difference but yet functions as a difference and produces the consciousness of a difference where there is no real distinction Thus, we say 'Existence is', 'Time *always* is', 'Difference is different' (from the thing of which it is a difference), 'Space is *everywhere*', &c. If we analyse these judgements, it will be seen that the copula 'is' in the first example conveys the same meaning as 'existence', 'time' in the second example the same idea as is involved in 'always', and so on; yet the above judgments are possible: this is due to the existence of what is here called *viśeṣa.*

This idea of *viśeṣa* which is only touched upon by our author here, is more fully elaborated with the use of identical expressions in many places, by Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa, e.g. in his *Siddhāntaratna (q. v.)*. It was obviously the doctrine of the school which is described as that of 'Unknowable (or Indescribable) Difference-Non-difference' (**अचिन्त्यभेदाभेद**).

This highest being Hari is what is meant by the term 'Ego'. (**अस्मदर्थो बोध्यः**). The term *Ego* means the soul in its purest essence—the transcendental self, so to say. And hence it can dispel the illusion of those who approach it and is attainable only by the liberated. The '*I*', in other words, means the highest and the most uncontaminated ego, which is the actor (**कर्त्ता**) as well as the enjoyer of the fruits of actions (**भोक्ता**).

It has been said before that the highest being or Viṣṇu is not altogether devoid of form—that he has a thinkable but at the same time highly spiritual form or *vigraha* This form, we are now told, is sometimes two-handed, sometimes four-handed, and sometimes eight-handed. In fact, he has been described in all these three forms. This, however, does not imply change or impermanence in him. They are all eternal and co-present in him, and any may appear at any time, just as diverse forms may make their appearance simultaneously

in some precious stones (वैदूर्यमणौ इव). But still, the two-handed form, we are told, is more beautiful, exhibits his attributes better and may, therefore, be taken as the highest. Strictly speaking, however, no one form should be considered separate from the other two. What our author means perhaps is that the highest divinity has to be meditated and to that extent a form must be assigned to him; he can be meditated in various forms; but the best probably is the form or the image of man.—Has not the Bible also said that man was created by God in his own image? The image of man, therefore, is the best form in which divinity can be contemplated by us.

This highest being not only bears the form of man but he is also the husband of Śrī. This is affirmed in several *śruti* texts. From the *śrutis* which speak of the absolute non-duality (अभेद) of the godhead, it must not be imagined that there can be in the highest being no such differentiation as that of Śrī as his consort. In fact, this differentiation is like the differentiation of fire and its heat—distinguishable from one another in thought yet inseparable. Viṣṇu's highest power is synonymous with Śrī and Sarasvatī. Of these two, again. the first is the higher, because it is the power of enjoyment (ह्लादप्रधाना) which is superior to mere consciousness (संविद्). But they should not be regarded as different from one another in any other sense than that in which different phases of consciousness are distinguishable from one another. And further, neither of the above two should be regarded as created: they are co-eternal with Hari himself.

Like Hari, his consort also possesses infinite attributes. The power to bring salvation to mankind and the power to make Hari favourably disposed towards man, are among these attributes.

Like Hari again, and with him, Lakṣmī also assumes diffe-

rent forms. Of these various manifestations of Lakṣmī, Rādhā is the highest and most perfect, just as of all the *avatāras* of Viṣṇu Kṛṣṇa is the highest and most perfect.

(3). *Jīva.*—The second of the *prameyas* is Jīva or individual soul. Jīva is subtle and indivisible consciousness. In view of certain texts which our author quotes, he cannot accept the theory that Brahma is the only so-called *Jīva* or conscious being and that there are no other conscious beings. On the contrary, he holds that there is a plurality of *Jīvas*.

Jiva is eternal and has consciousness as its attribute. It is atomic (अणु) and exceedingly fine, and yet by virtue of consciousness it pervades the whole body.

The word '*I*' also means the Jīva; and its true nature can be appreciated in a state of dreamless sleep when gross self-consciousness (अहंकार) is set at rest.

The *Jīva* or soul is different from the body and unlike the body it is not subject to change or decay. It is a part or *aṃśa* of the highest Being (परमात्मा). And it is both an agent and an enjoyer of the fruits of its own *karma*.

It should be recalled that our author has ascribed the same qualities of being an agent and enjoyer (कर्त्ता and भोक्ता) to the Highest Being also. This obviously can be explained by the theory that the individual is but an *aṃśa* or part of the Infinite—a spoke in the wheel, as it were. The question certainly is not free from difficulty; but this difficulty is not peculiar to Rādhādāmodara's system.

Rādhādāmodara cannot accept the theory that activity belongs to *prakṛti*, while *Jīva* only looks on and experiences the consequences of these actions. In other words, although he adopts the Sāṅkhya concept of *prakṛti*, he is definitely against the inaction-theory of the *puruṣa*. According to him, consequences of action can belong only to the agent; so, since *puruṣa* or *Jīva* has admittedly to bear the results of *karma*,

as he is responsible for the actions, the actions must be *his* i.e., he must be credited with the capacity for activity also. And this capacity for action is a permanent attribute of the soul. But in this activity also, the individual is subordinate to the Infinite. In other words, the *Jīva* is but a servant of the Lord and his function is to carry out His will.

A question may arise here, viz., if *all* individual souls are but servants of the Lord, how can there be any differences among them and how can one instruct another ? And if no instruction is possible, all philosophy becomes a vain endeavour. But this is not the fact. Just as fire contained in firewood is not kindled unless the wood is rubbed, so the stirring up of the soul by means of instruction is necessary in order that it may realise its true relation with the Lord. For this realisation, one must approach a preceptor, and receive from him the inspiration of divine love *(bhakti).* This *bhakti* is not possible without knowledge. Hence the need of instruction.

The *Jīvas* or individual souls continue to worship the Lord even when they are liberated. The distinction between the universal soul and the individual—between the infinite and the finite—between the *parātman* and *jīvātman,* is an eternal distinction and it continues even when the *jīva* is released from the bondage of earthly life. We have *śrutis* which affirm the distinction in earthly existence and also which affirm it in the *Jīva's* state of release.

Some of the texts which seem to speak of the identity of the individual and Brahma, should be understood as only affirming resemblance. Anything that is permeated by another thing, imbibes the character of that other thing. So is *Jīva* like unto Brahma. But there is a distinction between them which is never transcended.

If Brahma could be characterised as mere consciousness

and devoid of other attributes, such as greatness, subtlety, and so on, then his identity with the *Jīva* might be suggested. But Brahma has these attributes also which mark him off as different from *Jīva*.

Nor can we describe Brahma as indescribable–as altogether unknown and unknowable. Though there are texts which say that words cannot express him, yet, after all, they only mean that he is never *fully* comprehensible and that words cannot express him in his fulness. Partial knowledge of him and to that extent an expression of his attributes in words, is certainly possible; otherwise, how can we reconcile with these the texts which say that the Vedas seek to *express* him? Brahma, therefore, must be understood as having more or less cognisable attributes which distinguish him from the individual.

The theory that *Jīva* is but an ephemeral reflection of Brahma in *avidyā* is untenable. The arguments against the *avidyā*-theory are well-known; and so far as he repeats them, the arguments of our author need not be reproduced here. But he advances one interesting objection against this theory which cannot but strike us as a logical quibble. If, he argues, it is contended that there is no distinction between Brahma and *Jīva*, then a question will arise as to whether this non-difference *(abheda)* is different from Brahma or identical with him. It cannot be different, for, obviously if there is something (in this case, *abheda*) other than Brahma, then that in itself disproves the absoluteness of Brahma and thereby the *abheda*-theory also. Nor can non-difference be identical with Brahma, for in that case, the *śrutis* which affirm it would be guilty of redundancy by asserting what is self-evident. Underlying this second contention there is apparently the conviction that a *śruti* text must give us a real and synthetical proposition and not merely a verbal or analytical

statement. A *śruti* cannot merely say "A is A", 'Brahma is nothing but Brahma': for, these propositions bring no real and new knowledge to the mind.

Again, *abheda* cannot be taught, for where are the teachers of *abheda* ? Does the pretending teacher know it ? If so, he cannot think of the pupil as different from him and hence there can be no instruction. If he does not know *abheda*, surely he is not qualified to be a teacher; for, who can teach without knowing his subject ? Obviously, therefore, there can be no teaching of *abheda*. So the theory of *abheda* or non-difference between Brahma and *Jīva* is untenable. It will appear, however, that our author tries to demolish the *abheda* theory by assuming that if *abheda* be a fact, it must be a kind of attribute pertaining to Brahma. But is the absence of a difference to be understood as a positive quality like a differentia itself ?

This is also the way in which Rādhādāmodara attacks the *adhyāsa*-theory, viz., the theory that the world is an illusion brought about by *ajñāna* or ignorance. Is this ignorance true or untrue ? Is it a fact or not a fact ? If it be true, then it can never cease to be and an attempt to dispel it is in vain. If it be not true, then it cannot be believed in and there is no use discussing a thing which does not exist. Nor can it be something which is neither true nor untrue (सदसद्-विलक्षण), for such a thing does not exist. Our author quietly forgets that whatever may be the fate of the world as an ultimate reality, ignorance in real life is a fact and it can be dispelled too. But to proceed.

Rādhādāmodara concludes that the world is brought into existence by God with His *parā śakti* (परा शक्ति) as its efficient cause and Himself again in His *pradhānā śakti* (प्रधानाख्या) as the material cause; and the world is ultimately real (पारमार्थिक).

Incidentally our author develops a theory of error which

deserves a passing notice. Error, he says, is possible in case of similarity, as when a post is taken for a man. If either of the two things be absolutely non-existent, then there can be no question of mistaking one for the other. We may not know things as they are, but there must be things in order that one of them may be mistaken for another, and error may be possible at all. Hence there is a real world; and hence again, there are finite selves or *jīvas*,—eternally self-conscious like God and yet dependent on Him.

(4). *Prakṛti.*—Our author's views under this head are easily summed up: they are a replica of the *sāñkhya* theory of *prakṛti*, and need not detain us long. He, however, supports them with profuse quotations from *śruti* as well as *smṛti*.

Prakṛti is of course the base of the three *gunas* (सत्त्व, रजः, तमः). The characteristics of these *gunas* are well-known, as given in Īśvarakṛṣña and other Sāñkhya writers, and also in the Gītā.

Our author then proceeds to give an account of the evolution of the world out of *prakṛti*. If the three *gunas* are equilibrated in *prakṛti*, then there is no world and we have what is called *pralaya* or dissolution. But when this equilibrium is disturbed and the *gunas* intermingle with one another in different proportions, the world begins.

First of all, there is *mahat*: this, again, is of three kinds according to the predominance of one or other of the *gunas*. Out of *mahat* arises *ahaṃkara* which again is of three kinds in the same way. *Sāttvika ahaṃkāra* gives the deities presiding over the senses and also over *manas*. *Rājasa ahaṃkāra* gives the external sense-organs both of cognition as well as of action—altogether ten in number. And *tāmasa ahaṃkāra* gives the five sense-objects, viz., space, &c., i.e. the *tanmātras* as well as the *mahābhūtas*—the subtle elements as

well as the grosser elements. Out of these arises the universe consisting of the seven upper worlds and seven lower worlds and the fourfold life that inhabits it, viz., viviparous and oviparous and other animals and vegetables.

Directions of space (दिक्) are not counted independently, for they are but space itself viewed in relation to the movements of the sun. Similarly, the five *prāṇas* are not counted separately, for, they are but modifications of *vāyu*.

We have thus the twentyfour *tattvas* of *Sāṅkhya*, derived in an identical way. The conception of *linga śarīra* and *sthūla śarīra* (लिंग शरीर, स्थूल शरीर)—finer and grosser body—is also there but we need not dilate upon it.

Mahat and its evolutes are all derived from *prakṛti*, and, therefore, in the last analysis, should not be regarded as realities other than *prakṛti* which is their common matrix. They are but modifications of *prakṛti* and are not essentially different from it, just as pots made of earth are not essentially different from the earth of which they are made.

This explains the use of different names and numbers; in no other way can we explain our idea of an army or a wood or of any collection. A collection and the units constituting it are not fundamentally different. Between *prakṛti* and its evolutes the relation is more or less the same. Individually the evolutes are different from one another, together they make up *prakṛti*.

This leads us to our author's conception of the causal relation. Cause and effect are but two states of the same thing (एकास्मिन् द्रव्ये द्वे अवस्थे); they are different each from the other, but are not different from the object of which they are states. The Nyāya school holds that the threads are different from the canvas; but this is wrong; for, we never perceive a canvas away from the threads. The *Sāṅkhya* school holds that they are different in identity; but this is also wrong, for, it is self-contradictory. Hence effect is identical with cause.

So far as the evolution of *prakṛti* is concerned, the theory advanced here is in complete accord with that of the orthodox *Sāñkhya* school. But as has been pointed out in a previous section, this *prakṛti* itself is one of the powers (शक्ति) of of the Divine Person. This marks our author off from the *Sāñkhya* school as it is ordinarily interpreted and places him in the same line with Vijñānabhikṣu. But from Vijñānabhikṣu also he differs in his theory of the quintuple intermixture of subtle elements for the production of the grosser elements (see *ante*).

(5). *Time.*—Time is something devoid of consciousness (जड) and is devoid also of the three *guṇas*. It is the cause of our conception of past, present and future, of simultaneity, of quickness, and also of creation and dissolution. It is described as revolving like a wheel from a moment to eternity.

Time is eternal in the sense that it is never-ending (नित्य), and it is all-powerful. It existed even before creation. It regulates the processes of the world but is regulated, in its turn, by God. Time, therefore, has no effect upon God.

(6). *Karma.*—Karma is action brought about by effort and leading to other efforts; that is, action which is continuous and without a beginning, like the seed and the plant. It is a series without a beginning but with an end.

Karma is of two kinds—good and bad. That which is forbidden by the Vedas and which leads to evil consequences, is bad. And the opposite is good. Good actions, again, are of various kinds: *obligatory* (नित्य), that is to say, one, of which the non-performance is an evil; *desirable* (काम्य), i.e., that which is a means to an end and must be performed if a particular consequence is desired, e. g., if a man desires heaven, he must perform some *jajña*, which he need not perform otherwise; *contingent* (नैमित्तिक), i.e., an action which has to be performed *if* something happens, e.g., when a son is born. If the contingency does not arise, the action also has not to be performed; but when

the contingency occurs, the action is obligatory. Acts of *atonement* for wrongs done (प्रायश्चित्त) are another kind of good action. And so on.

Of the various kinds of action, the *kāmya* actions like the prohibited actions, are a hindrance to the attainment of *mukti.* And, therefore, they must be avoided. The other actions, viz., *nitya, naimittika,* and *prāyaśćitta,* should be performed, because they help to purify the soul. Actions done before the dawn of knowledge are, however, all destroyed by knowledge and those done after its appearance leave no taint upon the knowing person.

Thus it is by knowledge that the taint of *karma* is removed and it is by knowledge again that the Lord Hari may be attained. And there the soul resides in eternal bliss and has not to be born in flesh again.

This knowledge is of two kinds—knowledge of the invisible (परोक्ष) and knowledge of the non-invisible (अपरोक्ष). The first is derived from *śruti*; the second is what is expressed by the word *bhakti.* Of these, the first leads to Brahma in his *parā śakti* and the second leads to Brahma as directly manifested.

Some say that pure *bhakti* alone, developed by association with devout men, can purify the soul and lead to the attainment of Hari. On the question suggested here, however, our author is not dogmatic. He is aware of the view that *bhakti* alone is enough: he would not say that it is wrong; but he seems to favour the other view that knowledge also is necessary and would explain *bhakti* itself as a form of knowledge. In this he differs from the more extreme section of the Vaiśñava philosophers.

The five things (प्रमेय) that one must care to know have been discussed. Let one know them, follow the discipline indicated herein, and he will find himself pure and capable of attaining Hari and eternal bliss will be his.

वेदान्त-स्यमन्तकः ।

प्रथमः किरणः ।

श्री श्रीराधागोविन्दो जयति । (a)

सनातनं रूपमिहोपदर्शय
आनन्दसिन्धुं परितः प्रवर्द्धयन् ।
अन्तस्तमस्तोमहरः स राजतां
चैतन्यरूपो विधुरद्भुतोदयः ।

प्रमाणैर्विना प्रमेयसिद्धिर्नेत्यतस्तानि [प्रमाणानि] तावन्ति निरूप्यन्ते । [तत्र] प्रत्यक्षमेकं चार्वाकः, अनुमानं च वैशेषिकः, शब्दं च कपिलपतञ्जली, उपमानं च गौतमः, अर्थापत्त्यनुपलब्धी च मीमांसकः; ऐतिह्यसम्भवौ च पौराणिकः । इति तत्त्वनिर्णयेषु (१) पश्यामः ।

तदित्थं प्रत्यक्षानुमान-शब्दोपमानार्थापत्त्यनुपलब्धिसम्भवैतिह्यानि अष्टौ प्रमाणानि भवन्ति, तेष्वर्थसन्निकृष्टमिन्द्रियं प्रत्यक्षम्; घटमहं चक्षुषा पश्यामीत्यादौ । अनुमितिकरणमनुमानम्; गिरिर्वह्निमान् धूमादित्यादौ अन्वयादिज्ञानम् अनुमितिः; तत्करणं धूमादिति ज्ञानम् । आप्तवाक्यं शब्दः; यथा नदीतीरे पंच वृक्षाः सन्ति, यथा चाग्निष्टोमेन स्वर्गकामो यजेत, इत्यादौ (b)। संज्ञासंज्ञि –[सम्बन्ध]-ज्ञानमुपमितिः; तत्करणं सादृश्यज्ञानम् ।

अनुपपद्यमानार्थदर्शनेन उपपादकार्थान्तरकल्पनम् अर्थापत्तिः; पीनो देवदत्तो दिवा न भुङ्क्ते इत्यादौ; इह दिवा अभुञ्जानस्य पीनत्वमुपपन्नम् सत् तस्य नक्तंभोजित्वं गमयति (c) । घटाद्यनुपलब्ध्या घटाद्यभावो निश्चितः। अनुपलब्धिस्तु उपलब्धेरभावः इत्यभावेन प्रमाणेन घटाद्यभावो गृह्यते । शते दशकं सम्भवति इति

(a) B begins 'ओम् नमो गोविन्दाय विघ्नच्छिदे सुखदाय' ।

(b) B reads इत्यादिः; But the reading of D adopted here seems better.

बुद्धौ संभावनम् सम्भवः। अज्ञात-वक्तृकतागतपारम्पर्यप्रसिद्धम् ऐतिह्यम्; यथा इह वटे यक्षो निवसति इत्यादौ। अङ्गुल्युत्तोलनतो घटदशकादिज्ञानकरी चेष्टापि कैश्चिन्मानमिष्यते। एवं प्रमाणवादिनो विविधाः।

तेषु प्रत्यक्षमात्रवादिना चार्वाकेण अप्रतिपन्नः सन्दिग्धो विपर्यस्तो वा पुमान् न शक्यो व्युत्पादयितुम्, न चार्वाकदृशा प्रत्यक्षेण पुरुषान्तरवर्त्तिनो ज्ञानसन्देह-विपर्ययाः शक्याः प्रतिपत्तुम्। न चानवधृत-परगताज्ञानादिर्वक्तुं प्रवृत्तो ग्राह्यवाक्प्रेक्षावताम्; तस्मात् अनिच्छताऽपि तेन अनुमानमुपादेयमिति। अतः स परिहस्यते—

"चार्वाक तव चार्वङ्गी-जारतो वीक्ष्य गर्भिणीम्।
प्रत्यक्षमात्रविश्वासः घनश्वासं किमुज्झसीति" ॥

तेन च परगतानज्ञानादीन् अभिप्रायभेदात् वाक्यभेदात् लिङ्गात् अनुमाय तदज्ञानादिपरिहारे प्रवृत्तो ग्राह्यवाक् स्यादिति।

यत्तु शब्दोपमानयोर्नैव पृथक् प्रामाण्यमिष्यते अनुमाने गतार्थत्वात् इति वैशेषिकमतमित्याहुः, तन्मन्दम्; ग्रहचेष्टादौ अनुमानाप्रवृत्तेः। विशेषन्तूपरि वदिष्यामः।

तदेवं प्रत्यक्षानुमानशब्दाः प्रमाणानीति वृद्धाः। उपमानादीनामेष्वन्तर्भावात् पृथक् प्रमाणता नेत्याहुः। [तथाहि] उपमानं खलु यथा गौस्तथा गवय इति वाक्यं तज्जनिता च धीरागम एव गवयशब्दो गोसदृशस्याभिधायीति यः प्रत्ययः सोऽप्यनुमानमेव। यः शब्दो वृद्धैर्यत्रार्थे प्रयुज्यते, स असति वृत्त्यन्तरे तस्याभिधायी, यथा गोशब्दो गोत्वस्य। प्रयुज्यते च गोसदृशे गवयशब्द इति तस्यैव सोऽभिधायीति ज्ञानमनुमानमेव। यत्तु, चक्षुःसन्निकृष्टस्य गवयस्य गोसादृश्यज्ञानं तत्प्रत्यक्षमेव, इति नोपमानं पृथक् वाच्यम्।

यत्तु दिवाऽभुञ्जाने पीनत्वं नक्तं भुक्तिं विना नोपपद्यते, अतः पीनत्वान्यथानुपपत्तिप्रसूतार्थापत्तिरेव रात्रिभोजने प्रमाणम् इति, तन्न; तस्यानुमाने अन्तर्भावात्। अयं रात्रौ भुङ्क्ते, दिवाऽभुञ्जानत्वे सति पीनत्वात्। यस्तु रात्रौ न भुङ्क्ते, न स दिवाऽभुञ्जानत्वे सति पीनः। यथा दिवारात्रौ चाभुञ्जानः अपीनः, न चायं तथा; तत्तस्मात् तथा इति केवलव्यतिरेक्यनुमानमेतत्।

अनुपलब्धिश्च न पृथक्प्रमाणम्, घटाद्यभावस्य चाक्षुषत्वात्। अभावं प्रकाशयदिन्द्रियं स्वसम्बन्धभावविशेषणमुखेनेति नाप्रसङ्गः।

सम्भवस्तु शते दशकाद्यवगमः, स चानुमानमेव । शतत्वं हि दशकाद्यविनाभूतं शते दशकादिसत्त्वं अवगमयतीति ।

ऐतिह्यं त्वनिर्दिष्ट-वक्तृकत्वेन सांशयिकत्वात् न प्रमाणम् । आप्त-वक्तृकत्वे निश्चिते तु तस्यागमान्तर्भाव एवेति त्रीण्येव प्रमाणानि ।

[प्रत्यक्षं चानुमानं च शास्त्रं च विविधागमम् ।
त्रयं सुविदितं कार्यं धर्मशुद्धिमभीप्सता ॥] इति (2)

तत्र प्रत्यक्षं स्थूलमेव सन्निकृष्टं गृह्णाति, [नातिदूरं न चाति-समीपम्, यथा खमुत्पतन्तं पक्षिणं, यथा नेत्रस्थमञ्जनम् । मनस्य नवस्थिते स्थूलमपि तन्न गृह्णाति], यदुक्तं मे मनोऽन्यत्र गतं, मया न दृष्टमित्यादि । अभिभूतम् अनुद्भूतं च, सम्पृक्तमतिसूक्ष्मं च (a) तन्न गृह्णाति; यथा रविकिरणाभिभूतं ग्रहनक्षत्रमंडलम्, यथा क्षीरे दधिभावम्, यथा च जलाशये जलदाविमुक्तान् जलबिन्दून्, यथाक्षिसन्निकृष्टानपि परमाणून् । क्वचित् [प्रत्यक्षं] व्यभिचरति चैतत्, मायामूर्द्धावलोके (b) यज्ञदत्तस्य एवायं मूर्द्धा इत्यादौ ।

यद्यप्यप्रत्यक्षेऽपि वस्तुनि लिङ्गादनुमानम् प्रवर्त्तितुमलम्, तथापि तत् क्वचिद् व्यभिचरद्दृष्टम् वृष्ट्या तत्कालनिर्वापितवह्नौ चिरमधिकोद्दित्वरधूमे पर्वते वह्निमान् धूमादित्यादौ ।

तदेवं मुख्ययोरनयोर्व्यभिचारित्वात् तदन्येषान्तु तदुपजीविनां सुसिद्धं तत् । आप्तवाक्यलक्षणः शब्दस्तु कुत्रापि न व्यभिचरति–हिमालये हिमम् रत्नालये रत्नमित्यादि ; रविकान्तात्रविकरसंयोगे वह्निरुत्तिष्ठतीत्यादि । स खलु तन्निरपेक्षस्तदुपमर्द्दी तदविरोधस्तत्-सचिवस्तदनुग्राही तदगम्ये साधकतमश्च दृष्टः । तथाहि 'दशमस्त्व-मसि' इत्यादौ तन्निरपेक्षः; स एव शब्दः श्रोत्रं प्रविशन्नेव 'दशमो-ऽहमस्मि, इति प्रमायास्तिरस्कारिणं मोहं विनिवर्त्तयतीति तत्त्वं स्पष्टम् । सर्पदष्टे (c) त्वयि विषं नास्तीति मन्त्र इत्यादौ, वह्नितप्त-मङ्गम् वह्नितापेन शाम्यतीत्यादौ च तदुपमर्द्दकत्वम् । सौवर्णं भषितं स्निग्धमित्यादौ, एकमौषधम् त्रिदोषघ्नमित्यादौ च, स्वप्रति-पादिते ताभ्यामविरोधत्वं च । अग्निर्हिमस्य भेषजमित्यादौ, हीरक-गुणविशेषमदृष्टवद्भिः पार्थिवत्वेन सर्वं पाषाणादिद्रव्यम् लौहच्छेद्यम् इत्यनुमातुम् शक्यम्, नतु श्रुततादृशगुणकं हीरकं तच्छेद्यमित्यादौ

(a) D reads अतिकृष्णं च ।
(b) D reads मुण्डा ।
(c) D reads सर्पदंशिते ।

च, यथाशक्ति ताभ्यां साचिव्यकरणम् । दृष्टचरमायामूर्ध्नः [पुंसः] भ्रान्त्या सत्यप्यविश्वस्ते (a) स एवायमित्याशंकावारणादौ (b); 'अरे शीतार्त्ताः पान्थाः! मास्मिन् वह्निं सम्भावयत, दृष्टमस्माभिरसौ वृष्ट्याधुनैव निर्वाणः, किन्त्वमुष्मिन् धूमोद्गारिणि गिरौ सोऽस्तीति तेनैव ते बद्धमूले प्रतीते (c)। तच्छक्त्यगम्ये साधकतमत्वं च ग्रहाणां राशिसंचारे सूर्योपरागादौ च।

तदेवं सर्वतः श्रैष्ठ्ये शब्दस्य स्थिते तत्त्वनिर्णायकस्तु श्रुतिलक्षण एव, न त्वार्षलक्षणोऽपि, 'नावेदविन्मनुते तं बृहन्तम्' (3) 'औपनिषदं पुरुषं पृच्छामी' त्यादिश्रुतिभ्यः (4)। ऋषीणां मिथो विवाददर्शनेन तद्वाक्यानां तत्त्वनिर्णायकत्वासम्भवात् (d। नित्यः श्रुतिशब्दः। 'वाचा विरूप नित्ययेति' (e) (5) श्रवणात्।

'अनादिनिधना नित्या वागुत्सृष्टा स्वयम्भुवा।
आदौ वेदमयी नित्या यतः सर्वाः प्रवृत्तयः॥' (6)

इत्यादि स्मरणाच्च। भ्रमादिदोषविशिष्टजीवकर्त्तृकत्वविरहात् निर्दोषश्च स एव भवति।

इति वेदान्तस्यमन्तके प्रमाणनिर्णयः
प्रथमः किरणः॥

(a) D reads अप्यविश्वस्तेऽपि।

(b) The reading in both B and D seems to be corrupt here; D reads एवमित्यादौ only; whereas the reading given above seems to be that of B, but the letters are not quite clear.

(c) D reads प्रतीयते।

(d) B reads तन्निर्णायकत्व —।

(e) D reads 'वाचा निरूपणायेति' which is wrong.

द्वितीयः किरणः ।

अथ प्रमेयाणि निर्णीयन्ते । तानि च पंचधा ईश्वर-जीव-प्रकृति-काल-कर्मभेदात् ।

[तत्र] विभुर्विज्ञानानन्दसार्वज्ञ्यादिगुणवान् पुरुषोत्तम ईश्वरः । 'विज्ञान मानन्दं ब्रह्म' (7) 'सत्यं ज्ञानमनन्तं ब्रह्म' (8) 'यः सर्वज्ञः सर्ववित्' (9) 'सत्यकामः सत्यसंकल्पः (10) 'स उत्तमः पुरुषः' (11) इत्यादि श्रवणात् । स च सर्वेषां स्वामी जनि-विनाश-शून्यः । 'तमीश्वराणां परमं महेश्वरं तं दैवतानां परमं च दैवतम्, पतिं पतीनाम् परमं परस्ताद् (a) विदाम देवं भुवनेशमीड्यम्' (12) इति ।

'स कारणं कारणाधिपाधिपो न चास्य कश्चिज्जनिता (b) न चाधिप' (13) इति [च] श्रवणात् ।

तस्य एवम्भूतस्य क्वचित् जन्म तु अहीनस्वरूपस्वभावस्य आविर्भावमात्रम् बोध्यम्; 'अजायमानो बहुधा विजायते' (14) इति श्रुतेः ।

'अजोऽपि सन्नव्ययात्मा भूतानामीश्वरोऽपि सन् ।
प्रकृतिं स्वामधिष्ठाय सम्भवाम्यात्ममायया ॥' (15)

इति स्मृतिश्च ।

अतएव इहास्यविज्ञानात् (c) मुक्तिरित्युक्तम्—

'जन्म कर्म च मे दिव्यम् एवं यो वेत्ति तत्त्वतः ।
त्यक्त्वा देहं पुनर्जन्म नैति मामेति सोऽर्जुन ॥' (16)

इति ।

ननु ब्रह्मरुद्रादयोऽपि लोकेश्वराः कथ्यन्ते; सत्यं, भवन्तु ते ईश्वराः सामर्थ्ययोगात्; पारमैश्वर्यम् तु हरेरेव, 'तमीश्वराणा' मित्यादि श्रुतेः । ततश्च, राजसेवकेष्वपि राजत्ववत् तेषु ईश्वरत्वं तद्गुणांशयोगात् भाक्तं सिध्यति । ब्रह्मादयो [हि] हरेरुत्पन्ना श्रूयन्ते श्रीनारायणोपनिषदि (17)—

'अथ पुरुषो ह वै नारायणोऽकामयत, प्रजाः सृजेये' त्यारभ्य 'नारायणात् ब्रह्मा जायते नारायणाद्रुद्रो जायते नारायणात् प्रजा-

---

(a) D reads परस्माद् ।

(b) D reads कश्चित् instead of कश्चित् ।

(c) B reads एतद्रहस्यविज्ञानात् ।

पतिः प्रजायते नारायणादिन्द्रो जायते नारायणात् अष्टौ वसवो जायन्ते नारायणादेकादश रुद्रा जायन्ते नारायणाद्द्वादशादित्या' इत्यादिना। महोपनिषदि (18) च—

'एको ह वै नारायण आसीत् न ब्रह्मा न ईशान' इत्यारभ्य 'तस्य ध्यानान्तःस्थस्य ललाटात् त्र्यक्षः शूलपाणिः पुरुषो जायते बिभ्रच्छ्रियं सत्यं ब्रह्मचर्यं तपोवैराग्य' मित्यादि "तत्र ब्रह्मा [चतुर्मुखो] जायते' इत्यादि [च] श्रूयते।

नारायणशब्दः खलु श्रीपतेरेव संज्ञा 'पूर्वपदात् संज्ञायामग' (19) इति तस्यामेव णत्वविधानात्।

श्रीविष्णुपुराणे च—

'यस्य प्रसादादहमच्युतस्य
भूतः प्रजासृष्टिकरोऽन्तकारी।
क्रोधाच्च रुद्रः स्थितिहेतुभूतो
यस्माच्च मध्ये पुरुषः परस्तात्॥' इत्यादि (20)।

मोक्षधर्मे च—(21)

'प्रजापतिं च रुद्रं चाप्यहमेव सृजामि वै।
तौ हि मां न विजानीतो मम मायाविमोहितौ॥' इति।

छन्दोगास्तु रुद्रं विधिपुत्रं पठन्ति (22)।

'विरूपाक्षाय धात्रंशाय विश्वदेवाय सहस्राक्षाय ब्रह्मणः पुत्राय ज्येष्ठाय मोघाय कर्माधिपतये'—

इति शतपथे च (23)।

अष्टमूर्त्ति-ब्राह्मणे (24) 'संवत्सरात् कुमारोऽजायत कुमारोऽरोदीत् तं प्रजापतिरब्रवीत् कुमार किं रोदिषि यच्च मम तपसोऽधिजातोऽसीति (a) सोऽब्रवीत् अनपहतपाप्मा अहमस्मि हन्त नामानि मे देहि' इत्यादिना।

श्रीवाराहे च—

'नारायणः परो देवस्तस्माज्जातश्चतुर्मुखः।
तस्माद्रुद्रोऽभवद्देवः स च सर्वज्ञतां गतः॥'

इति (25)।

तदिदं च कल्पभेदात् संगमनीयम्। ननु, महेशादिसमाख्यया रुद्रे पारतम्यं मन्तव्यम्, मैवं, तस्या महेन्द्रादिसमाख्यावत् वैफल्यात् इन्द्रसमाख्या एव शक्रस्य तत् साधयेत् 'इदि परमैश्वर्ये' इति

(a) D reads 'तपसो विजातोऽसि।

धात्वर्थपाठात्। किं पुनर्महत्त्वविशेषितासौ? तस्या अनीश्वरत्वं सर्वाभ्युपगतम्, ऐश्वर्यं च कर्मायत्तं शतमखसमाख्यया अवगम्यते। एवं महादेवसमाख्यापि देवराजसमाख्यावत् बोध्या। तथा च प्रबलप्रमाणबाधात् सा सा च निष्फलैव महावृक्षसमाख्यावत् भवेत्। विधिरुद्रयोर्यज्ञपुरुषाराधनात् लोकाधिकारित्वं भारते स्मर्यते—(26)

'युगकोटिसहस्राणि विष्णुमाराध्य पद्मभूः।
पुनस्त्रैलोक्यधातृत्वं प्राप्तवान् इति शुश्रुमः'॥ इति।

'मया सृष्टः पुरा ब्रह्मा मद्यज्ञमयजत् स्वयम्।
ततस्तस्य वरान् प्रीतो ददावहमनुत्तमान्॥
मत्पुत्रत्वं च कल्पादौ लोकाध्यक्षत्वमेव च॥ इति। (27)

युधिष्ठिरशोकापनोदने च—

'विश्वरूपो महादेवः सर्वमेधे महाक्रतौ।
जुहाव सर्वभूतानि स्वयमात्मानमात्मना॥' इति। (28)

'महादेवः सर्वमेधे महात्मा
हुत्वात्मानं देवदेवो बभूव।
विश्वाँल्लोकान् व्याप्य विष्टभ्य कीर्त्या
विराजते द्युतिमान् कृत्तिवासाः॥ इति। (29)

पशुपतित्वं च रुद्रस्य वरायत्तं श्रुतिराह (30) 'सोऽब्रवीत् वरं वृणीष्व अहमेव पशूनामधिपतिरसौ (a) इति। तस्माद्रुद्रः पशूनामधिपतिरिति।

वेदापहारा[द्या]पदूरक्षा च विधेर्हरिकर्त्तकैव इति पाद्मे पठ्यते (31)। विधिवधपापात् रुद्रो हरिणा मोचित इति स्मर्यते। मात्स्ये रुद्रोक्तिः—(32)

'ततः क्रोधपरीतेन संरक्तनयनेन च।
वामाङ्गुष्ठनखाग्रेण छिन्नं तस्य शिरो मया'॥

ब्रह्मोक्तिश्च—

'यस्मादनपराधस्य शिरश्छिन्नं त्वया मम।
तस्माच्छापसमायुक्तः कपाली त्वं भविष्यसि॥' इति

(a) B reads—रसानि।

यद्वोक्तिश्च—

ब्रह्महत्याकुलो (a) भूत्वा चरन् तीर्थानि भूतले ।
ततोऽहं गतवान् देवि हिमवन्तं शिलोच्चयम् ॥
तत्र नारायणः श्रीमान् मया भिक्षां प्रयाचितः ।
ततस्तेन स्वकं पार्श्वं नखाग्रेण विदारितम् ॥
महत्यसृग्वती धारा तस्य पार्श्वे विनिःसृता ।

* * *

विष्णुप्रसादात् सुश्रोणि कपालं तत् सहस्रधा ।
स्फुटितं बहुधायातं स्वप्नलब्धधनं यथा ॥' इति ।

दुर्जयत्रिपुरहेतुकापत्निस्तारो हरिहेतुकः स्मर्यते भारते—

'विष्णुरात्मा भगवतो भवस्यामिततेजसः ।
तस्माद्धनुर्ज्यासंस्पर्शं स विषेहे महेश्वरः ॥' (33) इति ।

विष्णुधर्मे च (34)—

'त्रिपुरं जघ्नुषः पूर्वं ब्रह्मणा विष्णुपंजरम् ।
शंकरस्य कुरुश्रेष्ठ (b) रक्षणाय निरूपितम् ॥' [इति]

जृम्भणास्त्रेण बाणयुद्धापत्तितो रक्षितः स्मर्यते वैष्णवे—

'जृम्भणास्त्रेण गोविन्दः जृम्भयामास शंकरम् ।
ततः प्रणेशुर्दैतेयाः प्रमथाश्च समन्ततः ॥
जृम्भाभिभूतश्च हरो रथोपस्थ उपाविशत् ।
न शशाक तदा योद्धुं कृष्णेण क्लिष्टकर्मणा ॥' इति (35)

श्रीरामायणे परशुरामोक्तिः—(36)

'हुंकारेण महाबाहुः स्तम्भितोऽथ त्रिलोचनः ।

* * *

जृम्भितं तद्धनुर्दृष्ट्वा शैवं विष्णुपराक्रमैः ।

* * *

अधिकं मेनिरे विष्णुं देवाः सर्षिगणास्तदा ॥' इति ।

नरसखेन नारायणेन सह युध्यमानस्तेन सञ्जिहीर्षितो ब्रह्मणा प्रबोधितः प्रपत्त्या तेन संरक्षितः स्मर्यते भारते (37)—

(a) Both B and D read 'ब्रह्महा कुपितो' । But the above reading is found in the printed edition (Calcutta) of the Matsya Purana and seems better.

(b) Both B and D give this reading; but the Venkateswara edition of Visnu-dharmottara reads यदुश्रेष्ठ ।

'प्रसादयामास भवो देवं नारायणं प्रभुं ।
शरणं च जगामाद्यं वरेण्यं वरदं हरि' मित्यादिना ।
कालकूढाग्निस्तारश्च तत्कीर्त्तनादिति स्मर्यते ।]
'अच्युतानन्दगोविन्दमन्त्रमानुष्टुभं परम् ।
ओं नमः संपुटीकृत्य जपन् विषधरो हरः ॥' इति । (38)

सर्वेश्वरादन्ये तु सर्वे ब्रह्मादयः प्रलये नश्यन्तीति मन्तव्यम्—
'एको ह वै नारायण आसी' दिति श्रवणात् ।
'ब्रह्मादिषु प्रलीनेषु नष्टे लोके चराचरे ।
आभूतसंप्लवे प्राप्ते प्रलीने प्रकृतौ महान् ।
एकस्तिष्ठति सर्वात्मा स तु नारायणः प्रभुः ।'
इति भारतात् । (39)

'ब्रह्मा शम्भुस्तथैवार्कश्चन्द्रमाश्च शतक्रतुः ।
एवमाद्यास्तथैवान्ये युक्ता वैष्णवतेजसा ॥
जगत्कार्यावसाने तु वियुज्यन्ते च तेजसा ।
वितेजसश्च ते सर्वे पंचत्वमुपयान्ति वै ॥'
इति विष्णुधर्मात् । (40)

'प्रकृतिर्या मया ख्याता व्यक्ताव्यक्तस्वरूपिणी ।
पुरुषश्चाप्युभावेतौ लीयेते परमात्मनि ॥
परमात्मा च सर्वेषामाधारः पुरुषः परः ।
स विष्णुनामा वेदेषु [वेदान्तेषु च] गीयते ॥'
इति वैष्णवाच्च । (41)

'नष्टे लोके द्विपरार्द्धावसाने
महाभूतेष्वादिभूतं गतेषु ।
व्यक्तेऽव्यक्तं कालवेगेन याते
भवानेकः शिष्यते शेषसंज्ञः' ॥ इति भागवताच्च । (42)

तथा [च] हरिहेतुकोत्पत्त्यादिभिर्विध्यादीनामनीशत्वं [निर्बाधं] सिद्धम् । अतएव तद्भक्तिस्तैरनुष्ठीयते (a) ।
'अथापि (b) तत्पादनखावसृष्टम्
जगद्विरिंचोपहृतार्हणाम्भः ।
सेशं पुनात्यन्यतमो मुकुन्दात्
को नाम लोके भगवत्पदार्थः ॥' इति । (43)
'यच्छौचनिःसृतसरित्प्रवरोदकेन ।
तीर्थेन मूर्ध्न्यधिकृतेन शिवः शिवोऽभूत्—' ॥

(a) D reads तैरेवानुष्ठीयते ।
(b) D reads तथापि ।

इति च भागवतात् । (44)

'एकः प्रसारयेत् पादावन्यः प्रक्षालयेन्मुदा ।
परस्तु शिरसा धत्ते तेषु कोऽभ्यधिको वद' ॥

इति पुराणान्तराच्च । (45)

'ब्रह्मादयः सुराः सर्वे विष्णुमाराध्य ते पुरा ।
स्वं स्वं पदमनुप्राप्ताः केशवस्य प्रसादतः' ॥

इति नारसिंहाच्च । (46)

'ते देवा ऋषयश्चैव नानातनुसमाश्रिताः ।
भक्त्या संपूजयन्त्येनं गतिं चैषां ददाति सः ॥

इति नारायणीयाच्च । (47)

यत्तु 'भवांगपतितं तोयं पवित्रमिति पस्पृशुः' इति शिवांगस्पर्शात् गंगाम्भसः पावित्र्यं मन्यन्ते, तन्मन्दम्, उक्तवाक्येभ्यः । तेन शिरसा धृतत्वात् पवित्रमिदमिति विज्ञाय पस्पृशुरिति तदर्थाच्च । हरस्य गात्रसंस्पर्शात् पवित्रत्वमुपागते तत्रापि तस्य पावित्र्यं शुद्धिप्रदत्वम् प्राप्तमित्यर्थः ।

यत्तु साम्बलाभाय हरेः रुद्राराधनं पार्थविजयाय तत्स्तवनं च भारते स्मर्यते (48), तत्तु नारदाद्याराधनवल्लीलारूपमेव बोध्यम् । यत्तु द्रोणपर्वान्ते (49) शतरुद्रीयार्थं रुद्रं व्याचक्षाणो व्यासस्तस्य परमकारणत्वं प्राह, तत् खलु तदन्तर्यामि-[परब्रह्म]-परतया नेयं परब्रह्मद्वयाभावात् तद्द्वयस्यानिष्टत्वात् [च] ।

तदित्थं हरेः पारतम्ये सिद्धे केषुचित् पुराणान्तरेषु (a) विध्यादीनां पारतम्यं निशम्य न भ्रमितव्यम् । तेषां राजसतामसत्वेन हेयत्वात् । यदुक्तं मात्स्ये (50)—

'संकीर्णास्तामसाश्चैव राजसाः सात्त्विकास्तथा ।
कल्पाश्चतुर्विधाः प्रोक्ता ब्रह्मणो दिवसा हि ते ॥
यस्मिन् कल्पे तु यत्प्रोक्तं पुराणं ब्रह्मणा पुरा ।
तस्य तस्य तु माहात्म्यं तत्तत्कल्पे विधीयते ॥
अग्नेः शिवस्य माहात्म्यं तामसेषु प्रकीर्त्यते ।
राजसेषु च माहात्म्यमधिकं ब्रह्मणो विदुः ॥
संकीर्णेषु सरस्वत्याः पितॄणां च निगद्यते ।
सात्त्विकेषु च कल्पेषु माहात्म्यमधिकं हरेः ॥
तेष्वेव योगसंसिद्धा गमिष्यन्ति परां गतिम्' ॥ इति ।

कौर्मे च । (51)—

(a) B reads पुराणेषु ।

'असंख्यातास्तथा कल्पा ब्रह्मविष्णुशिवात्मकाः।
कथिता हि पुराणेषु मुनिभिः कालचिन्तकैः॥
सात्त्विकेषु तु (a) कल्पेषु माहात्म्यमधिकं हरेः।
तामसेषु शिवस्योक्तं राजसेषु प्रजापतेः॥' इति।

वेदविरोधिस्मृतीनां हेयत्वं मनुराह (52)—

'या वेदबाह्या स्मृतयो याश्च काश्च कुदृष्टयः। (b)
सर्वास्ता निष्फलाः प्रेत्य तमोनिष्ठा हि ताः स्मृताः'॥

तदेवं सात्त्विकानामेव पुराणानां (c) प्रमाजनकत्वात् उपादेयत्वम् तदन्येषान्तु विपर्यासकरत्वादेव हेयत्वम् सुव्यक्तमिति न तैर्भ्रमितव्यं सुधिया इति।

तस्य हरेस्तिस्रः शक्तयः सन्ति। पराख्या, क्षेत्रज्ञाख्या, मायाख्या च [इति]। 'परास्य शक्तिर्विविधैव श्रूयते स्वाभाविकी ज्ञानबलक्रिया च' (53), 'प्रधानक्षेत्रज्ञपतिर्गुणेशः संसारबन्धस्थितिमोक्षहेतुः' (54) इति च श्रूयते।

'विष्णुशक्तिः परा प्रोक्ता क्षेत्रज्ञाख्या तथापरा।
अविद्याकर्मसंज्ञान्या तृतीया शक्तिरिष्यते॥'

इति विष्णुपुराणाच्च। (55)

स च पराख्याशक्तिमद्रूपेण जगन्निमित्तम्। क्षेत्रज्ञादिशक्तिमद्रूपेण [तु] तदुपादानं च भवति। 'तदात्मानं स्वयमकुरुत' (56) इत्यादि श्रवणात्। स च देहदेहिभेदशून्यो हरिरात्ममूर्त्तिर्बोध्यः।

'सत्पुंडरीकनयनं मेघाभं वैद्युताम्बरम्।
द्विभुजं मौनमुद्राढ्यं वनमालिनमीश्वरम्॥' (57)
साक्षात् प्रकृतिपरोऽयं (d) गोपालः।
'तमेकं गोविन्दं सच्चिदानन्दविग्रहम्'॥ (58)
'अर्द्धमात्रात्मको रामो ब्रह्मानन्दैकविग्रहः'। इति श्रुतेः। (59)

तस्य गुणाश्च ज्ञानानन्दादयोऽनन्तास्ततो नातिरिच्यन्ते, एकधैवानुद्रष्टव्यम्। 'नेह नानास्ति किंचनेति श्रवणात् (60)। तथापि विशेषबलात् तद्भेदव्यवहारो भवति। विशेषश्च भेदप्रतिनिधिः भेदाभावेऽपि तत्कार्यम् प्रत्याययन् दृष्टः, सत्ता सती, भेदो भिन्नः, कालः

(a) D reads सात्त्विकेष्वथ कल्पेषु।
(b) D reads कुदृष्टयः।
(c) B reads पुराणादीनाम्।
(d) D adds the word आत्मा here.

सर्वदास्तीत्यादौ । तमन्तरा विशेषणविशेष्यभावादिकं न सम्भवेत् । न [च] सत्तासतीत्यादिधीः (a) भ्रमः, सन् घटः इत्यादिवदबाधात् । न चारोपः, सिंहो माणवको नेत्यादिवत् सत्तासती नेति कदाप्यव्यवहारात् । न च सत्तादेः सत्ताद्यन्तराभावेऽपि स्वभावादेव सतीत्यादिव्यवहारः, तस्यैवेह तच्छब्देन उक्तेः । तस्मात् निर्भेदेऽपि (b) हरौ भेदप्रतिनिधिः सोऽभ्युपेयः ।

'यथोदकं दुर्गे वृष्टं पर्वतेषु विधावति ।
एवं धर्मान् पृथक् पश्यन् तानेवानुधावति ॥

इति कठश्रुतेः । (61)

अत्र [हि] ब्रह्मधर्मानुक्त्वा तदभेदो (c) निषिद्धः, नहि भेदसदृशे तस्मिन्नसति, धर्मधर्मिभाव-धर्मबहुत्वे युक्ते भाषितुम् (d) । न च 'धर्मान्'—इत्यनुवादः, श्रुतितोऽन्येन तेषामप्राप्तेः । निर्विशेषवादिनापि शोधितात् पदार्थात् वाक्यार्थस्य ऐक्यस्य भेदो नाभिमतो भेदाभेदौ वा, तथा सति तस्य मिथ्यात्वाद्यापत्तेः । तत्र विशेषो न चेत् स्वप्रकाशचिद्भानोऽप्यैक्यस्याभानं तद्भानस्य भेदभ्रमाविरोधित्वेऽपि ऐक्यभानस्य तद्विरोधित्वं च, इत्यादि भेदकार्यं तस्य कथं स्यात् ? तस्मात् सर्वैः सोऽभ्युपेय एव; स च वस्त्वभिन्नः सन् निर्वाहकश्च इति नानवस्था तस्य तादृक्त्वं च धर्मिग्राहक-प्रमाणसिद्धं बोध्यम् ।

स च परमात्मा हरिरस्मदर्थो बोध्यः । 'अहमात्मा गुडाकेशेत्यादिषु (62) आत्माहमर्थयोरभेदेन स्मरणात् 'सोऽकामयत बहु स्यां प्रजायेय' (63) इत्यादि श्रुतौ प्रधानमहदहंकारादिसृष्टेः प्रागेव तत्सत्त्वप्रत्ययात् प्राकृतत्वं तस्य परास्तम् । 'तदात्मानमेवावेदहं ब्रह्मास्मीति' (64) श्रुतौ,

'अहमेवासमेवाग्रे नान्यद् यत् सदसत्परम् ।
पश्चादहं यदेतच्च योऽवशिष्येत सोऽस्म्यहम् ॥

इति स्मृतौ (65) [च] । अवधृत्या च शुद्धात्मनः अस्मदर्थत्वमुक्तम् । अतोऽन्त्तेऽपि स्थितिवाक् युज्यते । अतएव प्रपन्नमायानिरासकता मुक्तप्राप्यता च तस्य उक्ता—

'मामेव ये प्रपद्यन्ते मायामेतां तरन्ति ते ।
ततो मां तत्त्वतो ज्ञात्वा विशते तदनन्तरम् ॥'

(a) D reads सत्तादिधीः ।
(b) D reads त्रिभेदेऽपि, but this is meaningless.
(c) D reads तदभेदी —which is incorrect.
(d) D reads भावितुम् ।

इत्यादौ (66)। तस्मादहमर्थः परात्मा विशुद्धश्च; स एव कर्त्ता भोका च बोध्यः। 'स विश्वकृद् विश्वविदात्मयोनिरेष देवो विश्वकर्मा महात्मा'। (67) 'सोऽश्नुते सर्वान् कामान् सह ब्रह्मणा विपश्चिता' इति श्रुतेः। (68)

'पत्रं पुष्पं फलं तोयं यो मे भक्त्या प्रयच्छति।
तदहम्-भक्त्युपहृत मश्नामि प्रयतात्मनः॥'

इति स्मृतेः। (69)

'भक्त्या प्रयच्छती'ति उक्तेः भक्तेच्छयैव तस्य पूर्णस्यापि बुभुक्षादयोऽभिमतः तस्य तादृशत्वं च स्वेच्छामयस्येति ब्रह्मोक्तेः।

स च पुरुषोत्तमः कचिद्द्विभुजः क्वचिच्चतुर्भुजः क्वचिदष्टभुजश्च पठ्यते। तत्र द्विभुजो यथा अथर्वमूर्ध्नि 'सत् पुंडरीकनयन' मित्यादि। (70)

'प्रकृत्या सहितः श्यामः पीतवासा जटाधरः।
द्विभुजः कुंडली रत्नमाली धीरोधनुर्धरः॥' इति।

तैत्तिरीयके च। (71)

'दशहस्ताङ्गुलयो दशपद्या द्वावुरू द्वौ बाहू आत्मैव पंचविंशक' इति। (72)

रहस्याम्नाये च—(73)—'पाणिभ्यां श्रियमुद्वहन्ती'त्यादिना।

श्रीसात्वते च (74)—

'नादावस्थान गगने देवोऽनन्तः सनातनः।
शान्तः सम्वित्स्वरुपस्तु भक्तानुग्रहकाम्यया॥
अनौपम्येन वपुषा ह्यमूर्त्तो मूर्त्ततां गतः।
विश्वमाप्याययन् कान्त्या पूर्णेन्द्वयुततुल्यया॥
वरदाभयदेनैव शङ्खचक्राङ्कितेन च।
त्रैलोक्यधृतिदक्षेण युक्तः पाणिद्वयेन सः'॥ इति।

सङ्कर्षणे च। (75)—

'पुरुषोत्तमस्य देवस्य विशुद्धस्फटिकत्विषः।
समपादस्य तस्यैव ह्येकवक्त्रस्य संस्थितिः।
वरदाभयहस्तौ द्वावपवृत्ताख्यकर्मणः॥' इति।

चतुर्भुजो यथा विष्वक्-[सेन]-संहितायाम् (76)—

'अप्राकृततनुर्देवो नित्याकृतिधरो युवा।
नित्यातीतो जगद्धाता नित्यैर्मुक्तैश्च सेवितः॥
बद्धाञ्जलिपुटैर्हृष्टैर्निर्म्मलैर्निरुपद्रवैः।
चतुर्भुजः श्यामलाङ्गः श्रीभूलीलाभिरन्वितः॥

विमलैर्भूषणै र्नित्यै र्भूषितो नित्यविग्रहैः ।
पंचायुधैः सेव्यमानः शङ्खचक्रधरो हरिः' ॥ इति ।

श्रीदशमे च । (77)—

'तमद्भुतं बालकमम्बुजेक्षणं
चतुर्भुजं शङ्खगदाद्युदायुधम् ।
श्रीवत्सलक्ष्मम् गलशोभिकौस्तुभम्
पीताम्बरं सान्द्रपयोदसौभगम् ॥' इति ।

श्रीगीतासु च । (78)—

'तेनैव रूपेण चतुर्भुजेन सहस्रबाहो भव विश्वमूर्त्ते ।' इति ।

अष्टभुजो यथा चतुर्थे । (79)—

'पीनायताष्टभुजमण्डलमध्यलक्ष्म्या-
स्पर्द्धच्छ्रिया परिवृतो वनमालयाढ्यः ।
बर्हिष्मतः पुरुष आह सुतान् प्रपन्नान्
पर्जन्यनादरुतया सघृणावलोकः ॥' इति ।

आनन्दाख्यसंहितायाम् (80) तु रूपत्रयमुक्तम् ।

'स्थूलमष्टभुजं प्रोक्तं सूक्ष्मं चैव चतुर्भुजम् ।
परंतु द्विभुजं चैव तस्मादेतत्त्रयं यजेत् ॥' [इति] ।

एतानि रूपाणि भगवति वैदूर्यमणाविव युगपन्नित्याविर्भूतानि विभान्ति । तेषु चारुत्वाधिक्यात् कृत्स्नगुणव्यक्तेश्च द्विभुजस्य परत्वमुक्तम्, न तु वस्तुतोऽन्यत्वमस्ति (a), 'नेह नानास्ति किंचनेति (81) श्रवणात् (b) । यत्तु मन्यन्ते परमे व्योम्नि नित्योदितं च चतुर्भुजं रूपं परम्, द्विभुजादिरूपं तु शान्तोदितमपरामिति, तत् खलु अविचारिताभिधानमेव । सर्वे नित्याः शाश्वताश्च देहास्तस्य परात्मनः ।

'हानोपादानरहिता नैव प्रकृतिजाः क्वचित् ।
परमानन्दसन्दोहा ज्ञानमात्राश्च सर्वतः ।
सर्वे सर्वगुणैः पूर्णा सर्वदोषविवर्जिताः ॥" (82)

इति महावाराहोक्तिव्याकोपात् । परंतु 'द्विभुज'मिति कठोक्ति (c)-(83) विरोधाच्चापराद्धान्तस्पर्शापत्तेश्च । भेदहीनेष्वेव तेषु रूपेषु

(a) B reads 'वस्त्वन्यत्वमस्ति' ।

(b) B reads वचनात् for श्रवणात् ।

(c) B and D appear to read कंठ, but perhaps it should be कठ. The reference is apparently to the text quoted before (p. 11) as belonging to अथर्वमूर्ध्नि । (See Appendix 57 & 70).

अंशत्वांशित्वादिकम् (a) शक्तिव्यक्तितारतम्यसव्यपेक्षमाहुः। यदुक्तं वृद्धैः 'शक्तेर्व्यक्तिस्तथा व्यक्तिस्तारतम्यस्य कारणम्' इति (84)।

स च पुरुषोत्तमः श्रीपतिर्बोध्यः। 'श्रीश्च ते लक्ष्मीश्च पत्न्या'-विति [यजुः]-श्रुतेः (85)।

'कमलापतये नमः। रमामानसहंसाय गोविन्दाय नमो नमः। रमाधराय रामाय—' इत्यथर्व्वश्रुते [श्च] (86)। पूर्वत्र श्रीर्गीर्देवी, लक्ष्मीस्तु रमादेवीति व्याख्यातारः।

ननु 'नेहनानास्ति किंचन' इत्यादि श्रवणात् न ब्रह्मणि कश्चि-ल्लक्ष्म्यादिरूपो विशेषः शक्यो मन्तुम्, किन्तु अंगीकृतमायं विशुद्ध-सत्त्व-मूर्त्तिकं तत्तादृश्यैव लक्ष्म्या गिरा च युज्येत इति चेत्, भ्रान्त-मेतत्। वह्न्युष्णता इव स्वरूपभिन्ना पराख्याशक्तिर्ब्रह्मण्यस्ति, 'परास्य' इत्यादि श्रुतेः। सैव तस्य लक्ष्मी गीर्देवी च इति स्वीकार्यम्।

'प्रोच्यते परमेशो यो यः शुद्धोऽप्युपचारतः।
प्रसीदतु स नो विष्णुरात्मा यः सर्वदेहिनाम्॥'

इति श्रीवैष्णवात्। (87)

'अपरं तत् त्वरं (b) या सा प्रकृतिर्जडरूपिणी।
श्रीः परा प्रकृतिः प्रोक्ता चेतना विष्णुसंश्रया॥'

इति स्कान्दाच्च। (88)

'सरस्वतीं नमस्यामि चेतनां हृदिसंस्थिताम्।
केशवस्य प्रियां देवीं शुक्लां क्षेमप्रदां नित्याम्॥'

इति स्कान्दे गीःस्तोत्राच्च। (89)

इत्थं च पूर्वपक्षो निरस्तः। ननु, 'नेह नानास्ति किंचन' इति नि-र्विशेषत्वमुक्तम्, मैवम्। इह यदस्ति तन्नाना न, किन्तु स्वरूपानु-बन्ध्येवेति (c) तत्रैव विशेषप्रत्ययात्। 'श्रीश्च ते लक्ष्मीश्च' इत्यादि-प्रामाण्याच्च (d)। लक्ष्म्या एव रूपान्तरं गीर्देवीति मन्तव्यम्।

'सन्ध्या रात्रिः प्रभाभूतिर्मेधा श्रद्धा सरस्वती' इति [श्री] वै-ष्णवे [तस्याः] तथा विशेषणात् (90)। किंच,

'ह्लादिनी सन्धिनी सम्वित् त्वय्येका सर्वसंश्रये।
ह्लाद-तापकरी मिश्रा त्वयि नो गुणवर्जिते॥' (91)

(a) B reads अंशित्वांशत्वादिकम्।

(b) B reads here 'त्वक्षरम्'।

(c) D reads—'बन्ध्येति'।

(d) B reads 'इत्यादेः प्रामाण्याच्च'।

इति तत्रैव त्रिवृत् पराकीर्त्यते। तत्र सम्वित्प्रधाना वृत्ति र्गीर्देवी, ह्लादप्रधाना [तु] लक्ष्मीः, अनयोः पूर्वा तु उत्तरानुगुणैवावबोध्या। सम्विदः सुखानुधावनप्रधानप्रसिद्धेः लक्ष्म्या भगवदभेदादेव तद्वत्तस्या व्याप्तिश्च तत्रैव स्मर्यते—

'नित्यैव सा जगन्माता विष्णोः श्रीरनपायिनी।
यथा सर्वगतो विष्णुस्तथैवेयं द्विजोत्तम ॥ (92) इति।

ततो भेदे तु व्याप्तिरियमपसिद्धान्ताय घटेत। इत्थं च अस्या जीवकोटित्वं निरस्तम्। एषा लक्ष्मीः हरिवदनन्तगुणा तत्रैवोक्ता।—

'न ते वर्णयितुं शक्ता गुणान् जिह्वापि वेधसः।
प्रसीद देवि पद्माक्षि मास्मांस्त्याक्षीः कदाचन॥' इति। (93)

ते च गुणा मुक्तिदातृत्व-हरिवशीकारित्वादयः कतिचित् (a) तत्रैव पठिताः।—

'आत्मविद्या च देवि त्वं विमुक्तिफलदायिनी।
* * * *
का त्वन्या त्वामृते देवि सर्वयज्ञमयं वपुः।
अध्यास्ते देवदेवस्य योगिचिन्त्यं गदाभृतः॥
त्वया देवि परित्यक्तं सकलं भुवनत्रयम्।
विनष्टप्रायमभवत्त्वयेदानीं समेधितम्॥
दाराः पुत्राः तथागारं सुहृद्धान्यधनादिकम्।
भवत्येतत् महाभागे नित्यं त्वद्वीक्षणान्नृणाम्॥
शरीरारोग्यमैश्वर्यमरिपक्षक्षयः सुखम्।
देवि त्वद्दृष्टिदृष्टाणां पुरुषाणां न दुर्लभम्॥
* * * *
सत्त्वेन सत्यशौचाभ्यां तथा शीलादिभि र्गुणैः।
त्यज्यन्ते ते नराः सद्यः सन्त्यक्ता ये त्वयामले॥
त्वया विलोकिताः सद्यः शीलाद्यैरखिलैर्गुणैः।
कुलैश्वर्यैश्च युज्यन्ते पुरुषा निर्गुणा अपि॥
स श्लाघ्यः स गुणी धन्यः स कुलीनः स बुद्धिमान्।
स शूरः स च विक्रान्तो यश्च त्वया देवीक्षितः॥
सद्यो वैगुण्यमायाति शीलाद्याः सकला गुणाः।
पराङ्मुखी जगद्धात्री यस्य त्वं विष्णुवल्लभे॥"

इत्यादिना। (94)

(a) The mss. read कृति चेत्; but the above reading seems more sensible, for no objection seems to have been anticipated here.

हरिवद् बहुरूपेयं सर्वत्र तदानुरूप्येण तमनुयातीति च तत्रैवोक्तम्—

'देवत्वे देवदेहेयं मानुषत्वे च मानुषी।
विष्णोर्देहानुरूपां वै करोत्येषात्मनस्तनुम्॥ (95)

इति। तेषु सर्वेषु लक्ष्मीरूपेषु राधायाः स्वयम् लक्ष्मीत्वं मन्तव्यम्, सर्वेषु भगवद्रूपेषु कृष्णस्य स्वयं भगवत्त्ववत्, पुरुषबोधिन्यामथर्वोपनिषदि (96) 'गोकुलाख्ये माथुरमंडले' इत्युपक्रम्य 'द्वे पार्श्वे-चन्द्रावली राधिका च' इत्युक्त्वा 'यस्या अंशे लक्ष्मीदुर्गादिका शक्ति' रित्यभिधानात्।

"निरस्तसाम्यातिशयेन राधसा स्वधामणि ब्रह्मणि रंस्यते मम" (a) इति श्रीभागवते (97) [श्री] शुकोक्तेः। बृहद्गोतमीये च तन्मन्त्रकथने—

'देवी कृष्णमयी प्रोक्ता राधिका परदेवता।
सर्वलक्ष्मीमयी सर्वकान्तिः संमोहिनी परा॥' (98)

इत्युक्तेश्च।

'एते चांशकलाः पुंसः कृष्णस्तु भगवान् स्वयम्' (99) इति,
'अष्टमस्तु तयोरासीत् स्वयमेव हरिः किल' (100)
इति च, श्रीभागवतात्।

इति वेदान्तस्यमन्तके सर्वेश्वरतत्त्वनिर्णयो
द्वितीयः किरणः।

तृतीयः किरणः।

अथ जीवो निरूप्यते। [प] तल्लक्षणं चाणु चैतन्यमाहुः। श्रुतिश्च—

'एषोऽणुरात्मा चेतसा वेदितव्यो
यस्मिन् प्राणः पंचधा संविवेश'। (101)

'बालाग्रशतभागस्य शतधा कल्पितस्य च।
भागो जीवः स विज्ञेयः स चानन्त्याय कल्प्यते॥' (102)

'नित्यो नित्यानां चेतनश्चेतनानां
एको बहूनां यो विदधाति कामान्।
तं पीठगं ये तु यजन्ति विप्रा (b)
स्तेषां शान्तिः शाश्वती नेतरेषाम्॥' (103)

इति श्रवणात्। एतेन भ्रान्तं ब्रह्मैवेको जीवस्तदन्ये सर्वे जीवा-

---

(a) Both Mss. read 'मम' here, but in the printed *(Vangavasi)* edition of the Bhagavata, the reading is 'नमः' and from the context, this appears to be the correct reading.

(b) D reads धीरा।

दयस्तदविद्याकल्पिताः (a) स्वप्नद्रष्टेव रथादयः इत्येकजीववादो निरस्तः, नित्यचेतनतया बहूनां जीवानां श्रुतत्वात् ।

स च जीवो नित्यज्ञानगुणकः । 'अविनाशी वा अरे अयमात्मानुच्छित्तिधर्मा' (104) इति,

'नहि विज्ञातुर्विज्ञातेर्विपरिलोपो विद्यते' (105) इति [च] श्रुतेः ।

अणोरपि तस्य ज्ञानगुणेन सर्वांगेषु (b) व्याप्तिः, 'गुणाद्वा लोकवत्' (106) इति सूत्रात् ।

'यथा प्रकाशयत्येकः कृत्स्नं लोकमिमं रविः ।
क्षेत्रं क्षेत्री तथा कृत्स्नं प्रकाशयति भारत ॥'

इति भगवद्वाक्याच्च (107)

अस्मदर्थश्च जीवात्मा बोध्यः विलीनाहंकारायां सुषुप्तावहमिति तत्स्वरूपपरामर्शात् (c) ।

तथाच श्रुतिः—'सुखमहमस्वाप्सम् न किंचिदवेदिषम्' (108) इति । देहादिविलक्षणश्च षडभावविकारशून्यश्च सः—

'नात्मा वपुः पार्थिवमिन्द्रियाणि
देवा ह्यसुर्वायुजलं हुताशः ।
मनोऽन्नमात्रं धिषणा च सत्त्वं
अहंकृतिः खं क्षितिरर्थसाम्यम् ॥' (109) इति ।

'नात्मा जजान न मरिष्यति नैधतेऽसौ
न क्षीयते सवनविद्व्यभिचारिणां हि ।
सर्वत्र शश्वदनपाय्युपलब्धिमात्रं
प्राणो यथेन्द्रियबलेन विकल्पितं सत् ॥' (110)

इति च एकादशात् ।

परमात्मांशश्च सः ।

'ममैवांशो जीवलोके जीवभूतः सनातनः' । इति भगवद्वाक्यात् (111)

कर्त्ता भोक्ता च सः—

'विज्ञानं यज्ञं तनुते कर्माणि तनुतेऽपि च' (112) इति,

'सोऽश्नुते सर्वान् कामान्' (113) इति च श्रवणात् ।

यत्तु (d) प्रकृतिः कर्त्री भोक्ता तु जीव इत्याहुः, तन्मन्दम्; कर्त्तृत्वभोक्तृत्वयोरैकानिष्ठ्यात् । यदाह वनपर्वणि सोमकं यमः—

(a) B reads स्तदविद्यया कल्पिताः ।

(b) D reads सर्वज्ञ, which is meaningless.

(c) B reads—विमर्शात् ।

(d) D reads ये तु ।

'नान्यः कर्त्तुः फलं राजन्नुपभुङ्क्ते कदाचन' (114) इति।

ननु, कर्त्तृत्वे दुःखाभिसम्बन्धान्न तत्र श्रुते स्तात्पर्यमिति चेन्नैव-मेतत्। तथा सति दर्शादिष्वतात्पर्यापत्तेः लीलोच्छ्वासादेरकरणएव तत् सम्बन्धवीक्षणाच्च। न च निष्क्रियत्वश्रुत्या कर्त्तृत्वं जीवस्य बाध्यते। अस्ति-भाति-वेत्ति-धात्वर्थानामात्मनि सत्त्वेन निष्क्रियत्वासिद्धेः। धात्वर्थो हि क्रियेत्याहुः। न च निर्विकारत्वश्रुत्या तस्य तद्बाध्यते। सत्ता (a)-भानिज्ञानगुणाश्रयत्वेऽपि द्रव्यान्तरतापत्तिरूपस्य विकारस्य तत्राप्रसङ्गात्। यथा संयोगाश्रयत्वेऽप्याकाशे न कोऽपि विकार-स्तथा स्थूलक्रियाश्रयत्वेऽपि स नात्मनि इति द्रष्टव्यम्। सुषुप्तावपि सुखज्ञानसाक्षित्वरूपं कर्त्तृत्वमस्तीति पारमार्थिकं जीवस्य तत्। तच्च ईश्वरायत्तं बोध्यम्—'एष एव साधु कर्म कारयति' (115) इत्यादि श्रुतेः।

'परात्तु तत् श्रुते'रिति सूत्राच्च (116)।

स च जीवो भगवद्दासो मन्तव्यः।—

'दासभूतो हरेरेव नान्यस्यैव कदाचन' इति पाद्मात् (117)।

ननु, सर्वेषां जीवानां तद्दासत्वस्वरूपासिद्धेर्निर्विशेषे सति उप-देशादे वैयर्थ्यमिति चेत्, न (b) तदभिव्यंजकत्वेन तस्य सार्थक्यात्। नहि मथनेन विना दध्नि सर्पिः अरणौ च वह्निराविर्भवेत्। स च जीवो गुरूपसत्त्या तदवाप्तया हरिभक्त्या च पुरुषार्थीभवति।—

'यस्य देवे परा भक्तिर्यथा देवे तथा गुरौ।
तस्यैते कथिता ह्यर्थाः प्रकाशन्ते महात्मनः॥' इति। (118)

'आचार्यवान् पुरुषो वेद तस्य तावदेव चिरं यावन्न विमोक्ष्येऽथ संपत्स्ये' इति। (119)

'श्रद्धाभक्तिध्यानयोगादवैति' (120)। 'ततस्तु तं पश्यते निष्कलं ध्यायमानः' इति च श्रुतेः। (121)

'तस्माद् गुरुं प्रपद्येत जिज्ञासुः श्रेय उत्तमम्।
शब्दे परे च निष्णातं ब्रह्मण्युपसमाश्रयम्॥
तत्र भागवतान् धर्मान् शिक्षेत् गुर्वात्मदैवतः।
अमाययानुवृत्त्या यैस्तुष्येदात्मात्मदो हरिः॥'

इति स्मृतेश्च। (122)

सा च भक्तिः शास्त्रज्ञानपूर्विकैवानुष्ठेया। — 'तमेव धीरो

(a) D reads सत्त्वा।

(b) This is the reading of B. D reads, however, 'तत्तद'—instead of 'न तद' as above.

विज्ञाय प्रज्ञां कुर्वीत ब्राह्मणः' इति श्रवणात् । (123)

ते च जीवा मुक्तावपि हरिमुपासते । एतत् साम गायन्नास्ते—'तद्विष्णोः परमं पदं सदा पश्यन्ति सूरयः' इति श्रवणात् । (124)

इत्थं च सदानुभविनाम् (a) तदासत्त्या तद्रूपगुणविभूतीनां लावण्यचन्द्रिकात्वप्रसङ्गः (b) । तदित्थं विभूत्वाणुत्वादि-[मिथो]-विरुद्धशास्त्रैकगम्यानित्यगुणयोगात् ईश्वरजीवयोर्भेदः सार्वदिकः (c) सिद्धः । ननु, किमिदमपूर्वमुच्यते ईशादन्यो जीव इति—

"त्वं वा अहमस्मि भगवो देवते, अहं वै त्वमसि भगवो देवते, तद्योऽहम् सोऽसौ, योऽसौ सोऽहम्, तत्त्वमसि" (125) इति व्यवहारदशायाम्, 'यत्र त्वस्य (d) सर्वमात्मैवाभूत् तत् केन कं पश्येत्' (126) इति मोक्षदशायां च, तयोरभेदश्रवणात् । भेदस्यावस्तुत्वात् तद्ग्राही निन्द्यते

'यदेवेह तदमुत्र यदमुत्र तदन्विह ।
मृत्योः स मृत्युमाप्नोति य इह नानेव पश्यति ॥' (127)

'यदा ह्येव एष [एतस्मिन्] उदरम् अन्तरं कुरुते अथ तस्य भयम् भवति ।' इत्यादि श्रुतौ । (128)

नैतच्चतुरस्रम् ।—

'द्वा सुपर्णा सयुजा सखाया समानं वृक्षं परिषस्वजाते ।
तयोरन्यः पिप्पलं स्वाद्वत्ति अनश्नन्नन्योऽभिचाकशीति (129)

पूर्वस्याम्;

'यथोदकं शुद्धे शुद्धमासिक्तं तादृगेव भवति ।
एवं मुनेर्विजानतः आत्मा भवति गौतम ।' (130)

'निरंजनः परमं साम्यमुपैति' (131) [इति] परस्यां च तयोर्भेदश्रवणात् । [भगवता च] मुक्तौ भेदः स्मर्यते—

'इदं ज्ञानमुपाश्रित्य मम साधर्म्यमागताः ।
सर्गेऽपि नोपजायन्ते प्रलये न व्यथन्ति च ॥' (132) इत्यादौ ।

इत्थं च ब्रह्मैव सन् ब्रह्माप्येतीत्यादौ (133) 'ब्रह्मसदृशः सन्' इत्येवार्थः सुघटः; तत्र 'एव'-शब्दस्य सादृश्यार्थकत्वादेव । इतरथा ब्रह्मभावोत्तरो ब्रह्माप्ययः विरुद्धः स्यात् । 'यदेवेह' इत्यादौ ब्रह्माविर्भावेषु भेदग्राही निन्द्यते । 'यदाह्येव' इत्यादौ ब्रह्मणि कपटं

(a) B reads तदनुभविनाम् ।

(b) The text here in both mss. is corrupt. The reading adopted here is partly conjectural.

(c) D reads सार्ववादिकः ।

(d) D reads य एतदस्य ।

प्रतिषिध्यते इति न कापि क्षतिः । एवं सति 'त्वं वाहमस्मि' इत्यादौ यस्तयोरभेदः प्रतीतः, स खलु तदायत्तवृत्तिकत्व-तद्व्याप्यत्वाभ्याम् (a) संगच्छेत (b) । यथा प्राणसंवादे प्राणायत्तवृत्तिकत्वाद् वागादेः प्राणरूपता पठ्यते छान्दोग्ये (134)—

'न वै वाचो न चक्षूंषि न श्रोत्राणि न मनांसीत्याचक्षते प्राण इत्येवाचक्षते प्राणो ह्येव एतानि सर्वाणि भवति' इति ।

यो यद्व्याप्यः स तद्रूपः स्मर्यते श्रीवैष्णवे—

'योऽयं तवागतो देव समीपं देवतागणः ।
स त्वमेव जगत्स्रष्टा यतः सर्वगतो भवान् ॥' (135)

इति । श्रीगीतासु च—

'सर्वं समाप्नोषि ततोऽसि सर्वः' इति (136)। 'यत्र त्वस्य' इत्यत्र तु मुक्तस्य जीवस्य (c) विग्रहेन्द्रियादिकं सर्वं भगवत्संकल्पादेव भवतीति उच्यते । अन्यथा 'सर्वं' मित्येतत् व्याकुप्येत् ।

यत्तु वदन्ति 'त्वं वा' इत्यादौ जहदजहत्सार्थया लक्षणया विभुत्वाणुत्वादीन् गुणान् हित्वा चैतन्यमात्रं लक्षणीयमिति, तन्मन्दम्; नित्यगुणानां वाङ्मात्रेण हानासम्भवात्, सर्वशब्दावाच्ये लक्षणाया अयोगाच्च । तदवाच्यं खलु त्वया ब्रह्माभ्युपगम्यते । ननु

'यतो वाचो निवर्त्तन्ते अप्राप्य मनसा सह' (137) इत्याद्या श्रुतिरेव ब्रह्मतत्त्वं तथाह, मैवमेतत्; कृत्स्नावाच्यतायास्तत्राभिधानात् । यदुक्तं श्रीभागवते—'कार्त्स्न्येन नाजोऽप्यभिधातुमीशः' (138) इति । अन्यथा, 'सर्वे वेदा यत्पदमामनन्ति' (139) इति श्रुतिः, 'वेदैश्च सर्वैरहमेव वेद्यः' (140) इति स्मृतिश्च व्याकुप्येत् । [तत्रैव वाक्ये 'यत' इति 'अप्राप्य' इति च विरुध्येत । यत्त्वविद्यावच्छिन्नमविद्याप्रतिबिम्बितं वा ब्रह्मैव जीवः—

'आकाशमेकं हि यथा घटादिषु पृथग्भवेत् ।
तथात्मैको ह्यनेकस्थो जलाधारेष्विवांशुमान् ॥' (141)

इत्यादि श्रुतेः] (d); तद्विज्ञानेन अविद्याविनाशे तु तदद्वैतं सिद्धं

(a) B reads तदायत्तवृत्तिकः which is obviously wrong.

(b) D reads संगच्छते ।

(c) D reads मुक्तजीवस्य ।

(d) Of this portion of the text within square brackets, D contains only the last line from 'तथा—'. But apparently the preceding lines are necessary for the argument.

घटाद्युपाधिनाशे सत्याकाशाद्यद्वैतवत् इति वदन्ति, तदसत्; जडया अविद्यया चैतन्यराशेश्छेदायोगात् (a)। नीरूपस्य विभोः प्रतिविम्बायोगाच्च। अन्यथा वायुदिगादेस्तदापत्तिः। आकाशस्थ-ज्योतिरंशस्य तु तत्तया प्रत्ययो भ्रम एवेति तत्त्वविदः। (b)

श्रुतिस्त्वनुवादिनीत्याहुः। यत्तु वदन्ति अद्वितीये शुद्धचैतन्ये तदज्ञानात् जीवेश्वरादिभावाध्यासः, नभःस्वरूपापरिज्ञानात्तत्र यथा नीलिमाध्यस्यते, तज्ज्ञानेन तास्मिन्नध्यस्तस्य तस्य विनिवृत्तौ तु शुद्धं तदवशिष्यत इति, तदिदं रभसाभिधानमेव; अविषये तस्मिन् अध्यासायोगात्। नभसो ज्ञानविषयत्वात् तत्र नीलिमाध्यासः सम्भवति; न च तद्वत् शुद्धचैतन्यं ज्ञानविषयो भवताम्; तस्माद् यत्किंचिदेतत्। किंच, कीदृशं ज्ञानं निवर्त्तकमिष्यते? शुद्धचैतन्यं वृत्तिरूपं वा? नाद्यः, तस्य नित्यत्वेन नित्यमध्यस्तनिवृत्तिप्रसंगात्। नापि वृत्तिरूपं, तस्य सत्यत्वे [द्वैतापत्तेः, मिथ्यात्वे] कथमध्यस्तनिवर्त्तकता? सत्यस्य हि शुक्त्यादिज्ञानस्य रजताद्यध्यस्तनिवर्त्तकता दृष्टा।

यच्चाहुः (c) फलवत्यज्ञातेऽर्थे शास्त्रतात्पर्यवीक्षणात् तादृगभेदस्तत्तात्पर्यगोचरः; वैफल्याज् ज्ञातत्वाच्च भेदस्तद्गोचरः न स्यात् किन्त्वनूद्यमान एव सः—'अद्भ्यो वा [एष] प्रातरुदेति अपः सायं प्रविशति' (142) इत्यादिवत् इति, तन्मन्दम्।

'पृथगात्मानं प्रेरितारं च मत्वा जुष्टस्ततस्तेनामृतत्वमेति।
जुष्टं यदा पश्यत्यन्यमीशमस्य महिमानमेति वीतशोकः॥' (143)

इत्यादौ तत्र फलश्रवणात्, विरुद्धधर्मावच्छिन्नप्रतियोगितया (d) लोके तस्य ज्ञातत्वाच्च। ते च धर्मा विभुत्वाणुत्वादयः शास्त्रैकगम्या भवन्ति। अभेदस्त्वफलस्तत्र फलानङ्गीकारादज्ञात [श्च] नरशृङ्गवदसत्त्वादेव। अभेदबोधिकाः श्रुतयस्तु तदायत्तवृत्तिकत्व-तद्व्याप्यत्वाभ्याम् संगमिता एव।

किंचाभेदो ब्रह्मेतरो ब्रह्मात्मको वा? नाद्यः, अभेदहानात्, तदितरस्य मिथ्यात्वेन श्रुतीनामतत्त्ववेदकत्वापत्तेश्च। सत्यता च भेदस्य। मिथोविरुद्धयोरन्यतरनिषेधस्य अन्यतरविधिव्याप्तत्वात्। न चान्त्यः, ब्रह्मणः स्वप्रकाशतया नित्यं सिद्ध्या श्रुतीनां सिद्धसाधनतापत्तेः।

(a) D reads '—छिदायोगात्'।
(b) D reads तद्विदः।
(c) B reads यत्त्वाहुः।
(d) B reads प्रतियोगिकतया।

अपिच, नाभेदस्योपदेशः सिध्यति उपदेष्टुरनिर्णयात्। तथाहि, तदुपदेष्टा तज्ज्ञो (a) न वा? आद्येऽद्वितीयमात्मानम् विजानतः तस्य नोपदेश्यभेददृष्टिरिति न तं प्रति उपदेशः सम्भवेत्। अन्त्येऽप्यज्ञत्वादेव नात्मज्ञानोपदेष्टृत्वम्। अथ (b) अधिगताभेदस्य [अपि तस्य] बाधितानुवृत्तिरूपमिदं भेददर्शनं मरीचिकादिबुद्धिवत् (c) अतो नोपदेशानुपपत्तिरिति चेत्, मन्दमेतद् दृष्टान्तविरोधात्। तद्बुद्धिर्हि बाधितानुवर्त्तमानापि न वार्याहरणे प्रवर्त्तयेत्, एवमभेदज्ञानबाधिता भेददृष्टिरनुवर्त्तमानापि मिथ्यार्थविषयत्वनिश्चयात् नोपदेशे प्रवर्त्तयेदिति विषमं निदर्शनम्।

यत्तु शुद्धे चैतन्ये अज्ञानेन कल्पितमिदं विश्वं तज्ज्ञानेन बाध्यते रज्जु-भुजंगवत्, तेनाद्वैतं सिद्धमेव इति वदन्ति, तदपि निरवधानमेव चोदाक्षमत्वात्। तथाहि, क्वेदमज्ञान, ब्रह्मणि जीवे वा? न प्रथमः, स्वप्रकाशचैतन्ये तस्मिन् तद्योगासम्भवात्। तुरीयत्वहानाच्च। न द्वितीयः, कल्पनात्-पूर्वम् जीवभावासिद्धेः।

अथाज्ञानं सत्यं न वा? नाद्यः, अनिवृत्तिप्रसंगात्, नाप्यन्तः, प्रतीतिविरोधात्। न च सदसद्विलक्षणत्वादिष्टसिद्धिः, तादृशे प्रमाणाभावात्। घटादीनां सत्त्वं ख-पुष्पादीनाम् असत्त्वं घटादीनामेव (d) देशकालव्यवस्थया सदसत्त्वम् इति प्रकारत्रयस्य एव अनुभवान्नातोऽन्यत् सदसद्विलक्षण-मनिर्वचनीय-मज्ञानं स्वीकर्त्तुं शक्यम्। ततो यत्किंचिदेतत्। तस्मात् पराख्यशक्तिमता भगवता निमित्तेन प्रधानादिशक्तिमता च तेन उपादानेन सिद्धमिदं जगत् पारमार्थिकमेव। 'सोऽकामयत बहुस्यां प्रजायेय स तपोऽतप्यत स तपस्तप्त्वा इदं सर्वमसृजत यदिदं किंच' (144), 'कविर्मनीषी परिभूः स्वयम्भूर्याथातथ्यतोऽर्थान् व्यदधाच्छाश्वतीभ्यः समाभ्यः' (145), 'तदात्मानं स्वयमकुरुत' (146), इत्यादि श्रवणात्।

'तदेतदक्षरं नित्यं जगन्मुनिवराखिलम्।
आविर्भावतिरोभावजन्मनाशविकल्पवत्॥'

इति श्रीवैष्णवात् (147)।

(a) B reads तत्त्वज्ञो।
(b) D reads तथा।
(c) B reads मरीचिकावारिबुद्धिवत्।
(d) D reads घटादीनामेक-।

'ब्रह्म सत्यं तपः सत्यं सत्यं चैव प्रजापतिः ।
सत्याज्जातानि भूतानि सत्यं भूतमयं जगत् ॥'

इति महाभारताच्च (148) ।

'एकमेवाद्वितीयम्' (149) इत्यत्रापि वनलीन-विहङ्गवत् इति न्यायेन (a) तदापि जगत् सत्यं सिद्धम् । भ्रमवादस्तु सर्वथा अनुपपन्नः; 'सोऽकामयत' इत्यादिश्रुतिव्याकोपात् । किंच, क्व कस्यायं भ्रमः ? शुद्धचैतन्ये जीवस्य इति चेत्, न, तस्याप्रत्यक्षत्वात् । अध्यारोपे ह्यधिष्ठानसाक्षात्कारस्तन्त्रम् । न च शुद्धचैतन्यं स्वस्मिन् जगत् भ्रमेण पश्यति, तस्य नित्यसिद्धज्ञानत्वात् (b) । किंच सादृश्यावलम्बी भ्रमोऽनुभूयते, स्थाणुः पुमानित्यादौ । तथा च भ्रमविषयात् जगतोऽन्यत् पारमार्थिकं तत् सिद्धम् । अस्ति हि शुक्तिका रजतादन्यत् पारमार्थिकं हट्टस्थम् (c) तत् इत्यनुपपन्नस्तद्वादः । तस्मादीश्वरादन्य स्तद्वत् नित्यचेतनस्तद्दासो जीवो भवतीति सिद्धम् ।

इति वेदान्तस्यमन्तके जीवतत्त्वनिरूपणः

तृतीयः किरणः ।

—o—

चतुर्थः किरणः ।

अथ प्रकृतितत्त्वं निर्णीयते । सत्त्वादिगुणत्रयाश्रयो (d) द्रव्यं प्रकृतिर्नित्या च सा ।—

'गौरनाद्यन्तवती सा जनित्री भूतभाविनी ।
सितासिता च रक्ता च सर्वकामदुघा विभोः ॥'

इत्यादि श्रुतेः (150) ।

'त्रिगुणं तज्जगद्योनिरनादिप्रभवाप्ययम् ।
अचेतना परार्था च नित्या सततविक्रिया ।
त्रिगुणं कर्मिणां क्षेत्रं प्रकृते रूपमुच्यते ॥'

इति स्मरणाच्च (151) ।

तत्र प्रकाशादिहेतुर्गुणः सत्त्वम्; रागदुःखादिहेतुः रजः; प्रमादालस्यादिहेतु (e) स्तु तमः । एषां साम्ये प्रलयः एकदेहस्थकफवातपित्त-

(a) B reads वनलीनविहंगादिन्यायेन ।
(b) B reads नित्यसिद्धस्वरूपज्ञानत्वात् ।
(c) D reads इष्टस्थम् । The reading of B also is not quite clear but that given above seems to be the correct reading which gives a sense.
(d) D reads—गुणाश्रयो ।
(e) D reads भ्रमालस्यादि ।

साम्ये मृत्युरिव । अंगांगिभावेन वैषम्ये तु महदादिसर्गः स्यात् । प्रलये स्वरूपपरिणामः सर्गे तु विरूपः स इति 'सततविक्रिये'त्युक्तम्'

प्रकृतेरस्या प्रथमः परिणामो महान् आत्मन्यध्यवसायहेतुः । स च त्रिविधः—

'सात्त्विको राजसश्चैव तामसश्च त्रिधा महान्' इति [श्री] वैष्णवात् (152) । तस्मिन् विकारविशेषोऽहंकार आत्मनि देहाहंभावहेतुः ।

स च सात्त्विको राजसस्तामसश्चेति त्रिविधः क्रमाद्वैकारिक-तैजसभूतादिशब्दैश्चाभिधीयते । मध्यमस्तु द्वयोः प्रवर्त्तकतया सह-कारीत्याहुः । सात्त्विकादहंकारादिन्द्रियाधिष्ठात्र्यो देवता मनश्च । राजसाद् बाह्येन्द्रियाणि दश । तामसात्तु तन्मात्रद्वाराकाशादीनि पंच इति । एवमेवोक्तमेकादशे—(153)

'ततो विकुर्वतो जातो योऽहंकारो विमोहनः ।
वैकारिकस्तैजसश्च तामसश्चेत्यहं त्रिवृत् ॥
तन्मात्रेन्द्रियमनसां कारणं चिदचिन्मयः ।
अर्थस्तन्मात्रिकाज्जज्ञे तामसादिन्द्रियाणि च ॥
तैजसाद्देवता आसन्नेकादश च वैकृतात् ॥' इति ।

तामसादर्थः पंचभूतलक्षणः । तैजसादिन्द्रियाणि दश । वैकृता-देकादश देवता मनश्च इत्यर्थः । तृतीये च (154)—

'महत्तत्त्वाद्विकुर्वाणाद् भगवद्वीर्यचोदितात् (a) ।
क्रियाशक्तिरहंकारस्त्रिविधः समपद्यत ॥
वैकारिकस्तैजसश्च तामसश्चेत्यतो भवः ।
मनसश्चेन्द्रियाणां च भूतानां महतामपि ॥' इति ।

'मनसश्चे'ति चात् देवतानां चेति बोध्यम् क्रमादिति च (b) ।

अयमत्र निष्कर्षः ।—द्विविधं खल्विन्द्रियम्, अन्तरिन्द्रियम् बहिरिन्द्रियं चेति । तत्रान्तरिन्द्रियं मनः सात्त्विकाहंकारोपादानकं द्रव्यं संकल्पहेतुहृत्प्रदेशवृत्ति । (c)

तदेव क्वचिदध्यवसायाभिमानचिन्तारूपकार्यभेदाद् बुद्ध्यहंकार-चित्तसंज्ञां धत्ते । इदं मनो विषयसंसर्गे बन्धहेतुः, तं विहाय आत्म-प्रावण्ये तु मोक्षहेतुश्च भवति ।—

'मन एव मनुष्याणां कारणं बन्धमोक्षयोः ।
अशुद्धं कामसंकल्पं शुद्धं कामविवर्जितम् ॥'

(a) Both mss. read '-चोदितात्' here, but in the Calcutta edition of Bhagavata, it is 'सम्भवात्' ।

(b) D reads क्रमादि च ।

(c) D reads संकल्पविकल्पहेतुकृतप्रदेशवृत्ति ।

इति श्रुतेः (155)। तदित्थं स्मृत्यादिकारणमिन्द्रियं मनः सिद्धम्।

राजसाहंकारोपादानकं द्रव्यं बहिरिन्द्रियम्; तच्च द्विविधम्, ज्ञानेन्द्रियकर्मेन्द्रियभेदात्। तत्राद्यं पंचविधम् श्रोत्र-त्वक्-चक्षू-रसना-घ्राण-भेदात्। तत्र-शब्दमात्रग्राहकमिन्द्रियं श्रोत्रम्; मनुष्यादीनां कर्णशष्कुल्यवच्छिन्नप्रदेशवृत्ति, सर्पाणां तु (a) चक्षुर्वृत्ति। स्पर्शमात्रग्राहकमिन्द्रियं त्वक् सर्वशरीरवृत्तिः। नखकेशादौ प्राणमान्द्यतारतम्यात् स्पर्शानुपलब्धिः। रूपमात्रग्राहकमिन्द्रियम् चक्षुर्नयनवृत्ति। रसमात्रग्राहकमिन्द्रियं रसनं जिह्वाग्रवृत्ति। गन्धमात्रग्राहकमिन्द्रियं घ्राणं नासाग्रवृत्ति (b)।

श्रोत्रादीनां पंचानामाकाशादीनि पंच क्रमेणाप्यायकानि भवन्तीति भौतिकत्वमेषाम् उपचर्यते। एवं मनःप्राणवाचां च क्रमात् पृथिव्यप्तेजोभिराप्यायनात् तत्तन्मयत्वं [तेषाम्]। श्रुतिश्च—'अन्नमयं हि सौम्य मनः आपोमयः प्राणः तेजोमयी वागि'ति (156)।

अन्त्यमपि पंचविधं वाक्-पाणि-पाद-पायूपस्थभेदात्। तत्र वर्णोच्चारणहेतुरिन्दियं वाक् हृत्कण्ठादिवृत्तिः यदुक्तम्—

'अष्टौ स्थानानि वर्णानामुरः कण्ठः शिरस्तथा।
जिह्वामूलं च दन्ताश्च नासिकौष्ठौ च तालुश्च॥'

इति वेदभाष्ये (157)। गवादिष्वदृष्टभावात् तदभावः। शिल्पादिहेतुरिन्द्रियं पाणिः, मनुष्यादीनामङ्गुल्यादिवृत्तिः, हस्त्यादीनान्तु नासिकाग्रादिवृत्तिः (c)। संचारहेतुरिन्द्रियं पादः, मनुष्यादीनामङ्घ्रिवृत्तिः, उरगपतङ्गादीनामुरःपक्षादिवृत्तिः। मलादित्यागहेतुरिन्द्रियं पायुः, तत्तदवयववृत्ति। आनन्दविशेषहेतुरिन्द्रियमुपस्थः, स च मेहनादिवृत्तिरिति।

सात्त्विकाहंकारादिन्द्रियाधिष्ठात्र्य श्चन्द्रादय श्चतुर्दशदेवता भवन्ति। तेषु चन्द्रचतुर्मुख-शंकराच्युतैः क्रमात् प्रवर्त्तितानि मनोबुद्ध्यहंकाराचित्तानि संकल्पाध्यवसायाभिमानाचिन्ताः प्रवर्त्तयन्ति। दिग्वातार्कवरुणाश्विभिः क्रमात् प्रवर्त्तितानि श्रोत्र-त्वक्-चक्षू-रसना-घ्राणानि शब्द-स्पर्श-रूप-रस-गन्धान् प्रकाशयन्ति।

अग्नीन्द्रोपेन्द्र-यम प्रजापतिभिः क्रमात् प्रवर्तिता वाक्-पाणि-पाद-पायूपस्था वचनादानविहरणोत्सर्गानन्दाननुभावयन्तीति।

(a) D reads सर्पादीनां तु।
(b) D reads नासावृत्तिः।
(c) D reads नासिकाग्रवृत्तिः।

तामसाहंकाराचु तन्मात्राण्यन्तरीकृत्य पंच महाभूतान्युत्पद्यन्ते । तामसाहंकार-भूतवर्गयोरान्तरालिकः परिणाम स्तन्मात्रशब्दवाच्यो ऽविशेषशब्देन च (a) कथ्यते । यथा दुग्धदध्नोरान्तरालिकः कललः परिणामस्तथैष (b) द्रष्टव्यः । भूतवर्गस्तु विशेषशब्देनोक्तः । सूक्ष्मावस्था तन्मात्राणि स्थूलावस्था तु भूतानीति ।

एतां भूतोत्पत्तिप्रक्रियां बहुधा निरूपयन्ति । 'तस्माद्वा एतस्मादात्मनः आकाशः सम्भूतः आकाशाद् वायु'रित्यादि-(158)-श्रुत्यर्थच्छायामालम्ब्य' भूतात् भूतोत्पत्तिरित्येके। 'तदाहुः किन्तदासीत्' (159) इत्यादि सुबालश्रुतिम् 'तस्मादहंकारात् पंचतन्मात्राणि तेभ्यो भूतानि' (160) इति गोपालश्रुतिं च दृष्ट्वा केचिदेवं वदन्ति—भूतादेरहंकारात् पंच तन्मात्राण्युत्पद्यन्ते, तेभ्यः क्रमात् पंच भूतानीति । तां तां च श्रुतिं निभाल्य परे त्वेवं वर्णयन्ति—भूतादेः शब्दतन्मात्रं तस्मात्तेजः; तेजसो रसतन्मात्रं तस्मादापः ; अद्भ्यो गन्धतन्मात्रं ततः पृथिवीति ।

एषां पंचानां लक्षणानि—अस्पर्शवत्त्वे सति विशिष्ट-शब्दाधारत्वमाकाशत्वं; विशिष्टस्पर्शवत्त्वे सति रूपशून्यत्वमनुष्णाशीतस्पर्शवत्त्वे सति गन्धशून्यत्वम् च वायुत्वम्; उष्णस्पर्शवत्त्वं भास्वररूपवत्त्वं वा तेजस्त्वम्; शीतस्पर्शवत्त्वं निर्गन्धत्वे सति विशिष्टरसवत्त्वम् [वा] अप्त्वम् । विशिष्टगन्धवत्त्वं पृथिवीत्वमिति ।

भूतानां पंचीकृतत्वात् शब्दादीनां सर्वत्रोपलम्भो नानुपपन्नः । पंचीकरणं तु इत्थं बोध्यम् - सर्वेश्वरो हरिः पंचापि भूतानि सृष्ट्वा तानि प्रत्येकं द्वेधा समं विभज्य तयोः पंचकयोरेकं प्रत्येकं चातुर्विध्येन समं विभज्य तेषां चतुर्णाम् भागानाम् [स्व]-स्व-स्थूल-भागत्यागेन (c) अन्यस्मिन् पंचके योजनमिति । यदुक्तम् (161)—

'विभज्य द्विधा पंचभूतानि देव स्तदर्द्धाणि पंचाब्धिभागानि कृत्वा तदन्येषु मुख्येषु भागेषु तत् तत् (d) नियुञ्जन् स पंचीकृतिं पश्यति स्म' इति ।

एभ्यः पंचीकृतेभ्यः [भूतेभ्यः] चतुर्दश-लोक-खचितान्यण्डानि सन्तीति (e) । तेषु भूर्भुवःस्वर्महर्जनस्तपःसत्याभिधाःसप्तलोका उपर्युपरि सन्ति (f) ।

(a) B reads स ।
(b) D reads तथैव ।
(c) D reads योगेन, but that is not the meaning.
(d) B reads तं तम् ।
(e) B reads स निर्माति ।
(f) D reads उपविशन्ति ।

अतल-वितल-सुतल-रसातल-तलातल-महातल-पातालाख्याः सप्त-त्वधोधः सन्तीति । तेभ्य एव जरायुजाण्डज-स्वेदजोद्भिज्जानि चतुर्विधानि शरीराणि चाण्डवार्त्तिनां जीवानामुत्पद्यन्ते । तेषु मनुष्य-पश्वादीनि जरायुजानि । पक्षिपन्नगादीन्यण्डजानि । यूकामशकादीनि स्वेदजानि । तरु-गुल्मादीन्युद्भिज्जानीति ।

इह दिक् पृथक् द्रव्यं न कल्प्यते । सूर्य परिस्पन्दादिना आकाशस्य एव प्राच्यादिरूपतासिद्धेः । दिक्सृष्टिस्त्वन्तरिक्षादि-[सृष्टि]-वत् सिध्यति (a) ।

प्राणोऽपि न पृथक् तत्त्वम् । अवस्थान्तरापन्नस्य वायोरेव तत्त्वेन सिद्धेः । स च पंचविधः—प्राणापानसमानोदानव्यानभेदात् ।

महदादीनि पृथिव्यन्तानि तत्त्वानि समष्टिः, तेषु एकदेशोपादानेन क्रियमाणानि कार्याणि तु व्यष्टिरित्युच्यते । अपरे तु अष्टौ प्रकृतयः षोडश विकारा इति श्रुत्यनुसारेण भूतादेः शब्दतन्मात्रं तस्मादाकाशः स्पर्शतन्मात्रं च उत्पद्यते, स्पर्शतन्मात्रात् वायुः रूपतन्मात्रं च ; रूपतन्मात्रात् तेजो रसतन्मात्रं च, रसतन्मात्रात् आपो गन्धतन्मात्रं च सहैव उत्पद्यते, गन्धतन्मात्रात् भूमिरिति वर्णयन्ति । एषु आकाशादिषु पंचसु शब्द-स्पर्श-रूप-रस-गन्धाः पंच गुणाः यथोत्तरम् एकैक्याधिक्येन व्यज्यन्ते ।

तत्र (b) आकाशे शब्द एकः, वायौ शब्दस्पर्शौ [द्वौ], तेजसि रूपान्तास्त्रयः, अप्सु रसान्ता श्चत्वारः, पृथिव्यां तु गन्धान्ताः पंच [इति] ।

इह तन्मात्राणां विषयाणां [च] समाननामत्वश्रवणादभेदो न शङ्क्यः, पूर्वेषां भूतकरणत्वेन परेषां भूतधर्मत्वेन [च] भेदात् । तदित्थं प्रकृति-महद-हंकारैकादशेन्द्रियतन्मात्रपंचकभूतपंचकभेदेन चतुर्विंशति तत्त्वानि वर्णितानि । एषु प्रकृत्यादि त्रिकं भूतपंचकं च स्थूलदेहस्य उपादानम् ; इन्द्रियाणि तु भूषणार्पितरत्नानीव तदाक्रम्य तिष्ठन्ति । पंचतन्मात्राणि एकादश इन्द्रियाणि प्राणश्च सूक्ष्मदेहस्य उपादानमिति व्याख्यातारः । शरीरत्वं हि चेतनं प्रतिनियमेनाधेयत्वं (c) शेषत्वं च । भोगायतनं चेष्टाश्रयो वा शरीरमित्यादि तल्लक्षणं (d) तु दुष्टम् , पत्नीशरीरादावतिव्याप्तेः ।

(a) B reads सिध्येत् ।
(b) D reads अत्र ।
(c) B reads-विधेयत्वम् ।
(d) D reads only लक्षणं and omits तत् ।

इह प्रकृत्यादेरुत्पद्यमानं महदादि न द्रव्यान्तरम्, नहि मृत्पिंडादुत्पद्यमानं घटादिकमर्थान्तरमुपलभ्यते, किन्त्ववस्थान्तरमेव तत्र उत्पद्यते। तावतैव नाम-संख्या-व्यवहारादिभेदसिद्धिः, नान्यथा सेनावन-राश्यादि-व्यवहारः सिध्येत्। तस्मादेकास्मिन् द्रव्ये कारणकार्ये द्वे अवस्थे, ते च मिथो भिन्ने द्रव्यात्तु अभिन्ने भवतः। तन्तुपटात्मकं मिथो भिन्नमिति तार्किकाः मन्यन्ते, तन्न, अनुपलम्भात् उन्मानद्वैगुण्यापत्ते [श्च]; भेदाभेदमिति-सांख्याः प्राहुः, तच्च न, निरोधात्। तस्मादभिन्नमेव कारणात् कार्यमिति।

इति [श्री]-वेदान्तस्यमन्तके प्रकृतितत्त्व-
निर्णय श्चतुर्थः किरणः।

—o—

पंचमः किरणः।

अथ कालतत्त्वनिरूपणम्। त्रैगुण्यशून्यो जडो द्रव्यविशेषः कालः। स हि भूतभविष्यद्वर्त्तमानयुगपच्चिरात्त्विप्रादिव्यवहारस्य सर्गप्रलययोश्च हेतुःक्षणादिपरार्द्धान्तश्चक्रवत् परिवर्त्तमानो वर्ण्यते। तत्सिद्धिस्तु—

'ज्ञः कालकालो गुणी सर्वविद् यः'। (162)
योऽयं कालस्तस्य तेऽव्यक्तवन्धो
चेष्टामाहु श्चेष्टते येन विश्वम्॥
'निमेषादिर्वत्सरान्तो महीयां
स्तम् त्वेशानं क्षेमधाम प्रपद्ये।' (163)

'कालचक्रं जगच्चक्रम्'-(164) इत्यादि श्रुतिस्मृतिभ्यः। नित्यो विभुश्चैषः। 'सदेव सौम्येदमग्र आसीत्' (105) इत्यादि श्रुतिषु सर्गात् प्रागपि तस्य सत्त्वावगमात्, सर्वत्र कार्योपलम्भाच्च।

[यदुक्तं 'न सोऽस्ति प्रत्ययो लोके यत्र कालो न भासते' (166) इति। सर्वनियामकोऽप्ययं परमात्मना नियम्यो भवति, 'ज्ञः कालकालः' इत्यादि श्रवणात् तच्चेष्टात्वस्मरणाच्च।] (a)। अतस्तन्नित्यविभूतौ नास्य प्रभावः—

(a) This portion within square brackets is left out in D.

'न यत्र कालोऽनिमिषां परः प्रभुः ।
कुतो नु देवा जगतां य ईशिरे ॥' (a)

इत्यादि स्मृतेः (167)।

इति वेदान्त-स्यमन्तके कालतत्त्वनिरूपणः
पंचमः किरणः ।

षष्ठः किरणः ।

अथ कर्म निरूप्यते । तच्च क्रियारूपं कृतिसाध्यमपि कृतिमदनादिसिद्ध्या बीजाङ्कुरादिवदनादिसिद्धमुक्तम् । 'न कर्माविभागादिति चेन्नानादित्वा' दिति । (168)

तत् खलु अशुभं शुभं चेति द्विविधम् (b)। वेदेन निषिद्धम् नरकाद्यनिष्टसाधनं ब्राह्मणहननादि अशुभम्; तेन विहितं काम्यादि तु शुभम्। तत्र स्वर्गादीष्टसाधनं ज्योतिष्टोमादि काम्यम्; अकृते प्रत्यवायजनकं सन्ध्योपासनाग्निहोत्रादि नित्यम्; पुत्रजननाद्यनुबन्धिजातेष्ट्यादि (c) नैमित्तिकम्; दुरितक्षयकरं चान्द्रायणादि प्रायश्चितमिति शुभं बहुविधम् ।

एषु निषिद्धमिव काम्यं च मुमुक्षोर्हेयमेव मुक्तिप्रतिबन्धिफलत्वात् । नित्यादिकन्तु चित्तशुद्धिकरत्वात् तेनानुष्ठेयमेव। किंच ज्ञानोदयात् पूर्वम् यत् संचितम् तत् शुभमशुभं च ज्ञानेन विनश्यति । ततः परं क्रियमाणं [यत् ?] (d), न तेन विद्वान् विलिप्यते। तथाहि—

"तद् यथेषीकातूलमग्नौ प्रोतं प्रदूयेत एवं हास्य सर्वे पाप्मानः प्रदूयन्त" (169) इति ।

'यथा पुष्करपलाशे आपो न श्लिष्यन्ते एवमेवंविदि पापं कर्म न श्लिष्यते' (170) इति छान्दोग्यश्रुतिः । अत्र संचितक्रियमाणयोः पापयोर्विनाशविश्लेषावुक्तौ।

'उभे उ हैवैष एते तरत्यमृतः साध्वसाधुनीति' (171) बृहदारण्यकश्रुतिः । अत्र (e) [तु] तयोः पापपुण्ययोस्तौ दर्शितौ ।—

(a) D reads ईश्वरे, which is an obvious mistake. 'ईश्वराः' might be correct.

(b) B reads द्विभेदम् ।

(c) B reads पुत्रजन्मा—' ।

(d) The construction of the sentence requires a यत् here, but neither of the mss. gives that.

(e) D reads तत्र ।

'उभे' संचितक्रियमाणे 'साध्वसाधुनी' पुण्यपापे 'एष' विद्वान् 'तरति' उल्लंघयति । संचितयोर्विनाशः क्रियमाणयोस्त्वश्लेषः इत्यर्थः ।

इत्थं ज्ञानेनैव [विनिवृत्तकर्ममल स्तेनैव] हरिपदं प्राप्य अक्षय-सुखभाक् तत्रैव निवसति ततः पुनर्न आवर्त्तते (a)–'ब्रह्मविदाप्नोति परं' (172) 'तमेव विदित्वा अतिमृत्युमेति नान्यः पन्थाः विद्यते ऽयनाय' (173), 'सोऽश्नुते सर्वान् कामान्' (174), 'न च पुनरा-वर्त्तते' (175) इति श्रवणात् ।

तच्च ज्ञानं द्विविधम्, परोक्षमपरोक्षम् च । परोक्षं शाब्दम्; अप-रोक्षन्तु ह्लादिनी-सारसमवेतसम्विद्रूपं यच्च भक्ति-शब्द-व्यपदेश्यं दृष्टम् 'विज्ञानघनानन्दघनसच्चिदानन्दैकरसे भक्तियोगे तिष्ठतीति' (176) गोपालोपनिषदि । तत्र (b) पूर्वं परम्परया-(c) परन्तु साक्षात् ब्रह्म-प्रापकं बोध्यम् । केचित् (d) महत्तमप्रसंगलब्धेन शुद्धभक्ति-[योग]-रूपेण श्रवणकीर्त्तनादिकर्मणैव चित्तशुद्धिम् हरिपदं च लभन्त इति दृष्टम्—

["पिबन्ति ये भगवत आत्मनः सतां
कथामृतं श्रवणपुटेषु सम्भृतम् ।
पुनन्ति ते विषयविदूषिताशयम्
व्रजन्ति तच्चरणसरोरुहान्तिकम् ॥"] (177) (e)

इत्यादिषु ।

तादित्थं तत्त्वपंचकं विमृष्टं (f) श्रीवैष्णवे चोक्तमेतत्—

"विष्णोः स्वरूपात् परतो हि तेऽन्ये
रूपे प्रधानं पुरुषश्च विप्र ।
तस्यैव तेऽन्येन धृते वियुक्ते
रूपेण यत्तु द्विज कालसंज्ञं "॥ (178)

'जनैः स्वकर्म-स्तिमितात्मनिश्चयैः ।' (179) इत्यादिना । तदेव-

(a) D reads निवर्त्तते ।

(b) D reads अत्र ।

(c) B reads परया ।

(d) D reads क्वचित्तु ।

(e) This śloka is left out in D, but is obviously necessary for 'इत्यादिषु' which follows.

(f) D reads here विस्मृतविमृष्टं तं—which is rather cumbrous.

मेतत्पंचकविवेकी वर्णितसाधनसम्पत्तिमान् विशुद्धः श्रीहरिपद-मुपलभ्य तत्र एव सर्वदा दीव्यतीति ।

नित्यं निवसतु हृदये चैतन्यात्मा मुरारिर्नः ।
निरवद्यो निर्वृतिमान् (a) गजपतिरनुकम्पया यस्य ॥
राधादिदामोदरनाम बिभ्रता
विप्रेण वेदान्तमयः स्यमन्तकः ।
श्रीराधिकायै विनिवेदितो मया
तस्याः प्रमोदं स तनोतु सर्वदा ॥

इति [श्री] वेदान्तस्यमन्तके कर्मतत्त्वनिरूपणः
षष्ठः किरणः । [श्रीगौराङ्गसुन्दरो जयति सदा]

(a) B reads निर्वृत्तिमान् ।

APPENDIX A.

[*N. B.* All the quotations in the text have been serially numbered. The figures on the left-hand side indicate these numbers. The sources of the passages, as far as they have been traced, are given on the right-hand side.

The references to the Mahābhārata, Rāmāyaṇa and the Purāṇas are according to the Vangavāsi Edition, unless otherwise indicated.]

1. This seems to be a reference to another work by the author. But, as far as I know, the book has not been traced as yet.

   [Page 2, ll. 10–11. ('चार्वाक तत्व' etc.)—seems to be a popular joke of the anti-Chārvāka schools against Chārvāka.]

2. Manu-samhitā: xii. 105.
3. Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa: iii. 12. 9. 17.
4. Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad: iii. 9. 26.
5. Ṛg-veda: viii. 75. 6.
6 Mahābhārata: xii. 231. 56. (The passage is also quoted by Baladeva in his commentary on Jīva Goswāmi's *Tattva-sandarbha*. For different readings of the passage. See Nīlakaṇṭha's commentary on the Mahābhārata.)
7. Bṛhadāraṇyaka Up. iii. 9. 28.
8. Taittirīya Upaniṣad: ii. i.
9. Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad: i. 1. 9. (Also *ibid*, ii. 2. 7.).
10. Chāndogya Up. viii. 1. 5. (Also, *ibid*, viii. 7. 3).
11. Do. vii. 12. 3.
12. Śvetāśvatara Up. vi. 7.
13. *Ibid*: vi. 9.
14. White Yajus: xxxi. 19. Also, Taittirīya Āraṇyaka, iii. 13. 1. (cf. also Gauḍapāda Kārikā: iii. 24).
15. Gītā: iv. 6.
16. *Ibid*: iv. 9.
17. The Nirnaya Sagara Press (Bombay) Edition of the 108 Upaniṣads contains two Upaniṣads of this name. The quotation here is from the the smaller one (*q. v.*).
18. Chapter i. of Mahopaniṣad

(See Nirnaya Sagara Press Edition).

19. Pāṇini: viii. 4. 3.

20. Visṇu Purāṇa: iv. 1. 28.

21. Unlocated.

22. This quotation also is unlocated by me.

23. Śatapatha Brāhmana vi. 1. 3. (cf. also Siddhānta-ratna of Baladeva, iii. 40). (The quotation, however, is not continuous).

24. Do.

25. Varāha-Purāṇa: ch. 90. 3. But the reading given here is somewhat different from that in the Vaṇga-vāsi Edition of the Purāṇa, *q. v*

26. Unlocated.

27. Mahābhārata: xii. 339. 60-61. (The reading given here, however, is slightly different from that of the *Vangavāsi* Edition).

28. *Ibid:* xii. 8 36. (Here also the reading is somewhat different, though the sense is the same).

29. *Ibid:* xii. 20. 12. (slightly different reading).

30. Unlocated.

31. Unlocated.

32. Matsya-purāṇa: ch. 183.

33. Unlocated.

34. Visṇu-dharmottara: i. 195. 4. (Venkateśwara Press Edition).

35. Visṇu-Purāṇa: V. 33. 24-25.

36. Rāmāyaṇa: i. 75. 18-20.

37. Mahābhārata: xii. 342. 130. (reading slightly different).

38. Unlocated.

39. Do.

40. Visṇu-dharmottara: i. 171. 5-7. (Venkateśwara Press Edition. The third line reads differently from that given in this book).

41. Visṇu-Purāṇa: vi. 4. 38-39. (slight differences in reading).

42. Bhāgavata: x. 3. 25.

43. *ibid.* i. 18. 21.

44. *ibid:* iii. 28. 22.

45. Unlocated.

46. Narasiṇha Purāṇa (Bombay Edition) xxxii. 16.

47. Unlocated.

48. Mahābhārata vii. 200. (?) & xiii. 15. 4.

49. Mahābhārata: vii. 201.

50. Matsya-Purāṇa: ch. 290. 13 *et seq.* (Reading slightly different).

51. Kūrma Purāṇa: ii. 43. 50-51.

52. Manu Samhitā: xii. 95.

53. Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad:

vi. 8.

54. *ibid:* vi. 16. (But reading given here is slightly different).

55. Viṣṇu Purāṇa: vi. 7. 61.

56. Taittirīya Upaniṣad: ii. 7.

57. Gopāla-pūrva-tāpinī-upaniṣad: I.

58. *ibid:*

59. Rāmottara-tāpanīya Upaniṣad:

60. Kaṭha Upaniṣad: ii. 4. 11.

61. *ibid*: ii. 4. 14.

62. Gītā: x. 20.

63. Taittirīya Upaniṣad: ii. 6. 1.

64. Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad: i. 4. 10.

65. Bhāgavata: ii. 9. 32.

66. Gītā: vii. 14². and xviii. 55². (Two lines from two ślokas quoted is such a way as if they constituted one verse).

67. Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad: vi. 16. & iv. 17 (combined so as to look like one passage)

68. Taittirīya Upaniṣad: ii. 1.

69. Gītā: ix. 26.

'ब्रह्माद्धैः' in the next line refers to Bhāgavata x. 14. 2.

70. See *ante* (57).

71. Unlocated.

72. Do.

73. Do.

74. Sātvata-samhitā: (Conjeeveram Edition) ii. 69-71.

75. Unlocated. (Was there a book of this name? See Schrader's Introduction to the *Ahirbudhnya Samhitā*).

76 Unlocated: A *ms.* of this name has been mentioned by Aufrecht, but we have not been able to trace it. (See Schrader, *loc. cit.*).

77. Bhāgavata: X. 3. 9.

78. Gītā: xi. 46.

79. Bhāgavata: iv. 30. 7.

80. Unlocated: (The book cannot be traced: See Schrader, *loc. cit.*).

81. See *ante* (60).

82. Unlocated. (cf. Baladeva, सिद्धान्तरत्न, ii. 19).

83. The reference here seems to be to (57) & (70) before. Under (70), the source was described as अथर्वमूर्ध्नि. Here, however, it is referred to as कठ. (See footnote on p. 14). But the passage is found in गोपाल-पूर्व-तापिन्युपनिषत् (See under 57).

84. It appears to be a dictum of the School to which our author belonged. (cf. Baladevá, *loc. cit.* ii. 19 and his comment on the same where it is ascribed to श्री-रूप).

85. White Yajus: xxxi. 22. (Also. Taittirīya āraṇyaka: iii. 13. 2.).

86. Gopāla-pūrvatāpini-Upaniṣad : (fragments of different verses joined together. The last two words are part of a verse in Rāmapūrvatāpini-Upaniṣad : *q. v.*).
87. Viṣṇu-Purāṇa : i. 9. 45.
88. Unlocated.
89. Do.
90. Viṣṇu Purāṇa : i. 9. 117.
91. *ibid* : i. 12. 69. (But the last word in the first line is different here. *Vide* Vangavasi Edition and also *Caitanya-Caritāmṛta*, i. 4.63, where this śloka is quoted.).
92. *ibid.* i. 8. 15.
93. *ibid.* i. 9. 131.
94. *ibid* : i. 9. 118. *et seq.*
95. ibid : i. 9. 143.
96. Unlocated : The passage is quoted more fully in सिद्धान्तरत्न of Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa, ch. ii. (q. v.).
97. Bhāgavata : ii. 4. 14.
98. This śloka occurs in *Caitanya-caritāmṛta*, i. 4 83; also, in Padmapurāṇa, Pātālakhanda, ch. 50. 53; also in सिद्धान्तरत्न of Baladeva, ch. ii. The *Caitanyacaritāmṛta* quotes it, like our author, as a passage from बृहद्गोतमीय. There is a printed edition of 'गोतमीय-तन्त्र' published by the Vasumati office, Calcutta. But this passage is not found in that book nor is there any mention of राधा in it. Obviously, therefore, बृहद्-गोतमीय was different from गोतमीय.

This former book is very frequently quoted from by Vaiṣñava writers, as will appear from the references given above. One wonders if the book has been altogether lost. I, however, have not been able to trace it.

99. Bhāgavata : i. 3. 28.
100. *ibid* : ix. 24. 55.
101. Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad : iii. 1. 9.
102. Śvetāśvatara Up. v. 9.
103. *ibid* : vi. 13. (So far as the first two lines are concerned); also, Kaṭha Up. ii. 5. 13 (but the third line is different).
104. Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad : iv. 5. 14.
105. *ibid* : iv. 3. 30.
106. Vedānta-Sūtra : ii. 3. 25.
107. Gītā : xiii. 33.
108. Unlocated.

109. Bhāgavata: xi. 28. 24.
110. *ibid*: xi. 3. 38.
111. Gītā: xv. 7.
112. Taittirīya Up: ii. 5.
113. *ibid*: ii. 1.
114. Mahābhārata: iii. 128 14.
115. Kausītaki Upanisad: iii. 8. (This is the number of the passage according to Jacob's *Concordance* and also Śankara Bhāsya under *Sutra* ii. 3. 41. in the Nirnaya Sagara Press Edition. But according to the Nirnaya Sagar Press edition of the Upanisad (*q. v.*), the passage is numbered iii. 9. The quotation here is not continuous.).
116. Vedānta Sūtra: ii. 3. 41.
117. Unlocated.
118. Śvetāśvatara Up.: vi. 23.
119. Chāndogya Up: vi. 14. 2.
120. Kaivalya Up: i. 2.
121. Muṇḍaka Up: iii. 1. 8.
122. Bhāgavata: xi. 3. 21-22.
123. Bṛhad. Up. iv. 4 21.
124. Ṛg-veda. i. 22. 20. (also, Sāma-veda, viii. 2. 5.)
125. Varāha Upanisad: ii. 34.
126. Bṛhadāraṇyaka Up.: ii. 4. 14. & iv. 5. 15.
127. Kaṭha Up: ii. 4. 10.
128. Taittirīya Up: ii. 7.
129. Śvetāśvatara Up. iv. 6 (and Muṇḍaka Up: iii. 1. 1.).
130. Kaṭha Up. ii. 4. 15.
131. Muṇḍaka Up: iii. 1. 3.
132. Gītā: xiv. 2.
133. BṛhadāraṇyakaUp.iv.4.6.
134. Chāndogya Up. v. 1. 15.
135. Visṇu-Purāṇa: i. 9. 69-70.
136. Gītā: xi. 40.
137. Taittirīya Up.: ii. 4. 1. (also, ii 9. 1.).
138. Bhāgavata: xii. 4. 39.
139. Kaṭha Up.: 1. 2. 15.
140. Gītā: xv. 15.
141. Unlocated.
142. Do.
143. Śvetāśvatara Up. i. 6^2. and iv. 7^2. Also, Muṇḍaka; iii. 1. 2^2. It is not one verse but the second halves of two verses put together. In the Nirnay Sagar Edition of the Śvet., the last line reads '—महिमानमिति' instead of '—महिमानमेति' as here.
144. Taitt. Up. ii. 6.
145. Īśā Upanisad: 8.
146. Taitt. Up. ii. 7.
147. Visṇu-Purāṇa: i. 22. 58.
148. Mahābhārata: xiv. 35. 34.
149. Chāndogya Up.: vi. 2. 1.

150. Unlocated: (quoted by Baladeva also in his *Govindabhāsya*, *q. v.*).
151. Unlocated.
152. Viṣṇu-purāṇa : i. 2. 34.
153. Bhāgavata: xi. 24. 6-8.
154. *ibid*: iii. 26. 23-24.
155. The first line=Maitrāyaṇī-Upaniṣad: iv. 11[1]; Brahmabindu Up: 2[1]; and Śāṭyāyanīya Up: 1[1].
The second line=Maitrāyaṇī: iv. 6[2]; Brahmabindu: 1[2].

[The author was presumably quoting from memory. He has jumbled together two lines from different verses, if not different books, into an ostensibly single verse.].

156. Chāndogya Up: iv. 5. 4. (also, vi. 6. 4.).
157. The author is obviously thinking of Sāyana's *Bhāsya* on the Ṛg-veda. But the verse quoted here is part of Paniṇīya Śikṣā, 13, and is only referred to in Sāyana's Introduction to his Bhāṣya. [See Max muller's Edition (1849), p. 34.].
158. Taitt. Up. ii. 1.
159. Subāla-Upaniṣad: i.
160. Gopālottaratāpinī-Up: 9.
161. Unlocated:
162. Śvet. Up. vi. 2.
163. Bhāgavata: x. 3. 26.
164. Unlocated.
165. Chāndogya Up. vi. 2. 1.
166. Unlocated.
167. Bhāgavata: ii. 2. 17.
168. Vedānta-Sutra : ii. 1. 35.
169. Chāndogya Up: v. 24. 3.
170. *ibid*: iv. 14. 3.
171. Bṛhad. Up. iv. 4. 22.
172. Taitt. Up. ii. 1. 1.
173. Śvet. Up. vi. 15.
174. Taitt. Up. ii. 1. 1.
175. Chāndogya Up: viii. 15. 1.
176. Gopālottaratāpini-Up. (Nirnaya Sagar Press Edition, p. 520. The readings are slightly different).
177. Bhāgavata: ii. 2. 37.
178. Viṣṇu-purāṇa: i. 2. 24.
179. Unlocated.

APPENDIX B.

LIST OF AUTHORITIES QUOTED BY THE AUTHOR.

[*N. B.* The books are not always named by the author. In many cases, he quotes a passage as only *śruti* or *smṛti* (इति श्रुतिः, or, इति स्मृतेः, etc). An attempt has been made to locate these passages and the following list includes the names of books in which such passages have been found. Sometimes, a passage quoted is found in more than one book, e.g. passage no. 14 (*App. A*). In these cases, it is impossible to know from which of these books our author quoted; we have, therefore, given the names of all the books in which we have discovered the passage. There are also cases in which the book has been named but the quotation given has not been located. The following list contains the names of these books also, although the quotation remains unlocated, e.g. passage no. 76 above].

The numbers on the right-hand side indicate the serial number of the quoted passages: See *Appendix A.*

A. Śrutis.

1. Ṛg-veda: 5, 124.
2. Yajus (White): 14, 85.
3. Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa: 3, 72 (?).
4. ,, Āraṇyaka: 14 (See above).
5. Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa: 23,24.
6. Unnamed and unlocated Śruti: 30, 108, 141, 142 (?), 150.
7. Atharva-mūrdha. Upaniṣad: 71, 96 (?).
8. Īśa Upaniṣad: 145.
9. Kaṭha ,, 60, 61, 81, (103), 127, 130, 139.
10. Kaivalya ,, 120.
11. Kauṣītaki ,, 115.
12. Gopāla-pūrvatāpini Upaniṣad: 57, 58, 70, 83, 86.
13. Gopālottaratāpini ,, 160, 176.
14. Chāndogya ,, 10, 11, 119, 134, 149, 156, 165, 169, 170,

175.
15. Taittirīya Upaniṣad: 8, 56, 63, 68, 112, 113, 128, 137, 144, 146, 158, 172, 174.
16. Nārāyaṇa - Upaniṣad: 17.
17. Brahmabindu Upaniṣad: 155 (?).
18. Bṛhadāraṇyaka ,, 4, 7, 64, 104, 105, 123, 126, 133, 171.
19. Mahopaniṣad: 18.
20. Muṇḍaka - Upaniṣad: 9, 101, 121, 131, 143.
21. Maitrāyaṇī - Upaniṣad: 155 (?).
22. Rahasya (?) Upaniṣad: 73.
23. Rāmapūrvatāpini Upaniṣad: 86 (See above).
24. Rāmottaratāpini Upaniṣad: 59.
25. Varāha-Upaniṣad. 125.
26. Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad. 12, 13, 53, 54, 67, 102, 103, 118, 129, 143, 162, 173.
27. Śāṭyayanīya Upaniṣad. 155 (?).
28. Subāla-Upaniṣad. 159.

B. Smṛti.

1. Ānanda-saṃhitā 80.
2. Kūrma-purāṇa 51.
3. Gītā 15, 16, 62, 66, 69, 78, 107, 111, 132, 136, 140.
4. Narasimha Purāṇa. 46
5. Padma-Purāṇa 31, 117.
6. Pāṇini Sūtra 19.
7. Pāṇinīya Siksā. 157.
8. Bṛhad-gotamīya (tantra ?) 98.
9. Bhāgavata 42, 43, 44, 65, 77, 79, 97, 99, 100, 109, 110, 122, 138, 153, 154, 163, 167, 177.
10. Matsya Purāṇa 32, 50.
11. Manu Samhitā 2, 52.
12. Mahābhārata 6, 21, 26, 27, 28, 29, 33, 37, 38 (?), 39, 47 (?), 48, 49, 114, 148.
13. Mahāvarāha (purana ?) 82.
14. Rāmāyaṇa: 36.
15. Varāha-Purāṇa: 25.
16. Viṣñu-dharmottara. 34, 40.
17. Visvak-sena-samhitā. 76.
18. Viṣñupurāṇa. 20, 35, 41, 55, 87, 90-95, 135, 147, 152, 178.
19 Vedānta-sūtra. 106, 116, 168.
20. Sātvata-saṃhitā. 74.
21. Skanda-Purāṇa. 88, 89.
22. Saṃkarṣaṇa Saṃhitā. 75.
Unnamed Purāṇa: 45.
Unnamed Smṛti: (38 ?), 151, 164, 179.
Authorities not named: 161, 166.

APPENDIX C.

NOTE ON PAGE 4, LINE 2.

The reading given in the text was, as is indicated in the footnote, partly conjectural. The construction of the sentence that I had in mind and according to which this reading was adopted may be expressed thus.

"One who has once been misled by a false human head produced by a conjurer, may, even when seeing a real head, be led to think that it also is illusory, though it appeared otherwise: when such a tendency (to regard a प्रत्यक्ष as illusory) was combated by शब्द, it was a case of शब्द helping प्रत्यक्ष ('तदनुग्राही')."

The construction no doubt looked cumbrous, but no way out of it presented itself to me at the time. But after this portion was printed off, I came across this identical example in Jīva Gosvāmi's सर्वसंवादिनी and also in Baladeva's *Commentary* on Jīva's 'तत्त्वसन्दर्भ'.

Jīva says:

"दृष्टचरमायामुण्डकेन केनचिद् भ्रमात् सत्येऽप्यश्रद्धीयमाने सत्यमेवेदमिति नभोवाण्यादौ जानन्नपि" etc.

Baladeva says:

"दृष्टचरमायामुण्डकेन पुंसा सत्येऽप्यविश्वस्ते तस्यैवेदं मुण्डमिति नभोवाण्यानुगृहीतं प्रत्यक्षं यथा ।".

The use of the expression 'नभोवाण्या' in both the above extracts, led me to suspect that in the text as given by me 'स एवायमित्याशंकावारणादौ' might possibly be replaced by 'स एवायमित्याकाशवाण्यादौ." The Dacca Ms. does not contain anything like these words. The Benares Ms. is not with me at present; but as far as I can recollect, the word आकाश was there which I conjectured to be आशंका in view of the fact that

the next word was 'वारण'. It seems to me now, however, that this 'वारण' should be 'वारया' and 'आकाश' should remain as it is, and the whole should read as "आकाशवारयादौ" instead of आशंकावारणादौ'. In that case, the passage will be renderable as follows:

"One who had been once misled by a magic head, might be disinclined to believe a real head as such when he saw one, but the knowledge that it was a real head might be produced in his mind by an incorporeal voice declaring that it was a real one. This would be a case of शब्द helping प्रत्यक्ष."

This rendering simplifies the construction and I would certainly prefer this reading to what I have given in the text.